

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
HAMILTON, D. L.—The Composition of Anatole France's 'L'Orme du mail,'	245
WORKMAN, S. K.—Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus,	252
PEERY, WILLIAM.—A Metrical Puzzle in the 'Mirror for Magistrates,'	258
THOMAS, SIDNEY.—The Elizabethan Idea of Melancholy,	261
SULLIVAN, FRANK.—Cyme, a Purgative Drug,	263
DUNLAP, RHODES.—Some Unpublished Verses by Thomas Randolph,	264
DUNLAP, RHODES.—Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey, and "The Sovereign of the Seas,"	268
CAWLEY, R. R.—Burton, Bacon, and Sandys,	271
STEWART, B. T.—A Borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher,	273
FRENCH, J. M.—The Burning of Milton's 'Defensio' in France,	275
DANE II, NATHAN.—Milton's Callimachus,	278
LUMIANSKY, R. M.—A Note on Blair's Edition of 'The Unhappy Favourite,'	280
LARRABEE, S. A.—The "Closet" and the "Stage" in 1759,	282
ALSPACH, R. K.—A Dublin Milton Enthusiast,	284
DENNIS, LEAH.—"Gill Morice" in the 'Reliques' Again,	286
WASSERMAN, E. R.—Moses Browne and the 1783 Edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher,	288
GRUBB, G. G.—On the Serial Publication of 'Oliver Twist,'	290
MCDABID, R. I., JR.—'Ivanhoe' and Simms' 'Vasconcelos,'	294

## REVIEWS:—

C. F. SCHREIBER (ed.), Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust, A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University staff. [W. Kurrelmeyer.]	297
T. A. KIRBY, Chaucer's <i>Troilus</i> , A Study in Courtly Love. [R. K. Root.]	300
B. FAÏ, Civilisation Américaine; I. H. HERSON, The Small Town in Ameri- can Literature; P. MILLER, The New England Mind. [Herbert Brown.]	302
W. A. KINNE, Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800. [E. L. Avery.]	305
A. M. RYAN, A Map of Old English Monasteries. [F. P. Magoun.]	306
C. VAN DOREN, The American Novel; C. J. WEBER, Hardy of Wessex. [J. W. Beach.]	308
G. R. ELLIOTT, Humanism and Imagination. [Robert Shafer.]	309
W. S. LEWIS and W. H. SMITH (eds.), The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. [R. K. Root.]	310
R. L. SHARP, From Donne to Dryden: The Revolt Against Metaphysical Poetry. [Austin Warren.]	312
LÉONE RIVES, Charles Reade, sa vie, ses romans; <i>It's Never Too Late to Mend</i> , an edition. [A. M. Turner.]	313
M. R. LOWERY, Windows of the Morning, a critical study of William Blake's "Poetical Sketches." [M. O. Percival.]	314
L. B. WRIGHT, The First Gentlemen of Virginia. [T. P. Abernethy.]	316
ESTELLE KAPLAN, Philosophy in the Poetry of E. A. Robinson. [Elisabeth Nitchie.]	317
BRIEF MENTION: D. WORCESTER, The Art of Satire; J. MERSAND, Traditions in American Literature; R. L. HAWKINS, Positivism in the United States (1853-61); M. E. CLARK, Peter Porcupine in America: The Career of William Cobbett,	318
CORRESPONDENCE: A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's <i>Homburg</i> ? Rousseau and Faust; The Review of English Studies,	321

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Footnotes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RBS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

## PERFECT YOUR FRENCH in Hospitable French Canada

McGill University  
FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL  
Montreal

June 26 — August 8

The McGill Summer School is a long established School and an integral part of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Its courses of study are of university standard for undergraduates, teachers, and graduate students who are working for the McGill M.A. degree; others qualified to take the courses are welcome. Certificates show equivalent semester hours for university credit.

Co-educational. Residence in new Douglas Hall. French staff. French alone spoken at all times. Conversation and practical work with the language in a natural French atmosphere. Ideal summer weather and vacation attractions. Fee (tuition, board and lodging), \$180.00 (Canadian).

Canada welcomes American visitors and U.S. currency is at a considerable premium.

Write today for booklet—

Director, French Summer School,  
McGill University; Montreal, Can.



## A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PART IV, THE PERIOD OF RACINE  
1673—1700

By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER  
*Professor of French Literature in the  
Johns Hopkins University*

In two volumes, 996 pages, cloth, \$10

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

pitzer

itors  
n the  
script  
ticles  
o the  
es of  
Quo-  
not  
MP,  
itors  
iness





# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LVI

APRIL, 1941

Number 4

---

## THE COMPOSITION OF ANATOLE FRANCE'S *L'ORME DU MAIL*

It is a stock criticism of Anatole France that he never wrote an entire book of better than mediocre composition. Some have said that his faulty composition was the result of his lack of a sustaining creative imagination; others, that he was simply too lazy or too careless to plan an architecturally constructed book. So far as I know, however, no study has been made to show how a book grew under the hand of Anatole France and also to indicate actual flaws in its composition.<sup>1</sup> This article is an attempt to trace some of the steps in the development of *L'Orme du mail*, the first of the four volumes of the *Histoire Contemporaine*, to point out some of the minor structural flaws which resulted from its complicated history, and to correlate France's writing of the book with the events of his own life.<sup>2</sup> By its very nature this study cannot be complete; some of it must be conjectural and much will remain problematical, to be clarified definitely only when more of Anatole France's correspondence has been published.

It is safe to say that none of France's works was less planned in advance than his *Histoire Contemporaine*. The series of articles which constitute it began on January 22, 1895, under the title

<sup>1</sup> Charles Braibant in *Du Boulangisme au Panama. Le Secret d'Anatole France* (Paris, 1935), p. 116 and *passim*, pointed out the influence of *le boulangisme* on France's works; E. Preston Dargan in *Anatole France* (New York, 1937), pp. 441-461, discusses France's treatment of the Thais story.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the statements in this article are based upon data which I have already published in "Notes on Historical References in Anatole France's *L'Orme du mail*," *MP*, August, 1940, pp. 73-83; parts of the earlier article are pertinent here but I shall not repeat them.

*Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*.<sup>3</sup> From that time until November 3, 1896, France published twenty-seven articles.<sup>4</sup> Before January 13, 1897, he chose twenty-six of these articles, deleted some pages and added others, and made radical changes in the order of the articles to form the volume whose first edition appeared on that date. In order to make a volume of these articles France had to make more alterations than in any of his other books which had first appeared serially.

In the articles for the first volume of the *Histoire Contemporaine* France was seeking his way. *L'Orme du mail* has fewer and weaker threads to hold it together than the other three volumes, though certainly none of the four has real unity in the usual sense of the word. The second volume has more unity, perhaps because it was written in less time; for by then the author had found his way.<sup>5</sup> Soon after the beginning of the third volume Anatole France entered, at first rather mildly, the Dreyfus struggle. This theme is the main thread of the third and fourth volumes.

Seven of the twenty-seven articles of *L'Orme du mail* appeared in 1895, the remainder in 1896.<sup>6</sup> The rivalry between Lantaigne and Guitrel for the bishopric of Tourcoing is the link which binds together these seven articles.<sup>7</sup> As early as these first articles it

<sup>3</sup> This rubric is a tongue-in-cheek reminiscence of the Jansenist periodical published under the same title in the eighteenth century.

<sup>4</sup> All bibliographical data, unless otherwise indicated, are from Anatole France, *Œuvres Complètes*, Carias edition (Paris, 1927), XI, 455-458.

<sup>5</sup> *Le Mannequin d'osier* tells the story of the disruption of the Bergeret household (i. e., the household of Anatole France).

<sup>6</sup> Except the short story, *Un Substitut*, of 1894, which France inserted as Chapter XIV.

<sup>7</sup> Carias in *Œuvres Complètes*, XI, 456, says the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth chapters appeared in 1895. In *Livres, Manuscrits, Dessins provenant des bibliothèques de Madame Arman de Caillavet et de Madame Gaston de Caillavet, Manuscrits et Lettres d'Anatole France* (Georges Andrieux, expert), (Paris, 1932) the order of Chapters VII and VIII is inverted, putting Chapter VIII in 1895 before the article of Chapter VII which is said to be of 1896. It has been impossible to refer to the original serial edition of the articles which cannot be found in this country. Internal evidence leaves little doubt that the information in *Œuvres Complètes* is correct; for in Chapter VIII, p. 84 of Volume XI, Guitrel tells the prefect, Worms-Clavelin, of the sarcastic remark his rival, Lantaigne, had made in Chapter VII, p. 77, about the archbishop. This incident seems not to be a later addition.

becomes quite apparent that Lantaigne has no chance to get the coveted bishopric. The reader is led to expect a quick resolution of the struggle by the success of Guitrel. Certainly there is nothing in the plot to indicate that even the author realized Guitrel would have to wait until the end of the third volume to gain the bishopric.

When Anatole France began to write *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, his general subject, the satirical treatment of ecclesiastical intrigues, was apparently clear in his mind. In the seven articles of 1895 there are notably few elements which do not pertain rather directly to the contest for the bishopric, the main foreign element being the article which forms Chapter x, the last article before an interruption of twelve months in the publication of the articles. Chapter x contains a typical dialogue on Jeanne d'Arc which will be considered in greater detail in another part of this study.<sup>8</sup>

In the later articles, those of 1896, various motifs appear which have little relation with the original plot, but which simply by force of repetition tend to produce a factitious sort of unity. Such motifs are Paillot's bookshop and its *coin des bouquins*, the widow Houssieu, the scabrous Tricouillard allusions, etc. The later development of the articles in 1896 gives no indication that their trend had been planned in 1895.

A bare enumeration of the shifts that France made to rearrange the articles into volume form suffices to prove that he could not have planned the book. The first five chapters comprise the five articles which appeared from January 22 to March 26, 1895. Chapter vi consists of three articles which appeared from May 24 to June 9, 1896, fourteen months later than Chapter v. For Chapter vii France cast back to the article of March 5, 1895. The article of May 17, 1896, forms Chapter viii; it appeared fourteen months after Chapter vii. Chapter ix, the article of April 21, 1896, appeared some twelve months after Chapter x, the article of April 2, 1895. Two articles constitute Chapter xi, those of May 5 and May 12, 1896. France formed Chapters xii and xiii of the six articles which were published consecutively from June 23 to July 28, 1896. In Chapter xiv is the story *Un Substitut* which had been published in December, 1894. Chapter xv consists of the articles of August 4 and August 25, 1896, and Chapter xvi of those of October 27

<sup>8</sup> For further details concerning this dialogue on Jeanne d'Arc see the article to which I referred in note 2, above, pp. 75-79.

and November 3, 1896. France again broke the order of the articles by taking that of September 8, 1896 to make Chapter XVII.

That confusing jumble of interwoven dates and the discrete elements in the book show how little importance can be attached to the plot of *L'Orme*, and indicate clearly that none of it had been planned beyond the first few articles.

The complicated reorganization of the articles for the edition of 1897 produced some minor errors in the structure of *L'Orme*. Since *L'Orme du mail* was a book on contemporary events, the chronology of those events coincided rather well with that of the composition of the articles, for the events were usually transplanted into the articles soon after their occurrence. The dismemberment of this chronology in the rearrangement of the articles to make the book inevitably presented problems of synchronization. Since France, with his customary carelessness in such trivia, did not solve all these problems correctly, certain errors of chronology resulted. I shall point out only a few of them.

The story starts in the spring or summer, for on p. 38 we read: "Cette année-là, un jour d'été, M. Guitrel . . . trouva dans le magasin M. Worms-Clavelin. . . ." That must be the summer of 1896, since this contemporary chronicle was published in January, 1897. On p. 71 the meadows are still green, and shortly afterward we hear Lantaigne and Bergeret converse on the mall ". . . selon leur coutume d'été." A few pages further the lilacs are still blooming;<sup>9</sup> then suddenly Dr. Fornerol tells us it is now 1897,<sup>10</sup> though at the beginning of the next chapter the sun still shines glaringly and ". . . un cantonnier dormait au fond du fossé. . . ." <sup>11</sup> Three chapters later, in Chapter XVI, the prefect goes hunting at Valcombe.<sup>12</sup> This places the time in September or soon thereafter, as the hunting season opened in the first week of September.<sup>13</sup>

This cavalier disregard for the normal order of the seasons is explained by the times at which these chapters were written. The first four references above, all of which indicate the setting is in spring or summer, are from articles written, respectively, on March 12 and March 5, in April and in May, though the first three articles are of 1895 and the last is of 1896. Fornerol's definite men-

<sup>9</sup> Anatole France, *op. cit.*, XI, 109.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197.

<sup>13</sup> *L'Illustration*, No. 106, September 7, 1895, p. 194.

tion of the date 1897 is in an article of June or July 1896.<sup>14</sup> The next two references are of July, 1896. The allusion to the prefect's hunting is of October 27, 1896; therefore his hunt was, as originally conceived by the author, in season and legal. Of course France named the year 1897 to bring his contemporary history up to date with the first edition of 1897. But there is no attempt to synchronize with reality the references in *L'Orme* to the seasons, and consequently the book seems to be laid in a land of eternal spring and summer.

Another discrepancy in time is noticed when Worms-Clavelin remarks that now, when the Tsar is about to visit France, the Republic must identify itself with the upper classes and put them in contact with Russia.<sup>15</sup> In reality Nicholas II disembarked at Cherbourg on October 5, 1896.<sup>16</sup> The articles of this Chapter XVI were published on October 27 and November 3, 1896. To one who read the *articles* in the *Echo de Paris* the flavor of contemporaneity was distinct. But to one who read the *book* in 1897 it must have seemed strange to find that Fornerol gave the date of action as 1897, some seventy pages *before* the prefect said the Tsar was *about* to visit France, for actually the Tsar had come and departed before that time.

In the first edition of *L'Orme* Bergeret was said to have three daughters.<sup>17</sup> In *Le Mannequin d'osier*, however, France wrote that Juliette, the younger of the *two* daughters, went with her mother when she left Bergeret.<sup>18</sup> The error was corrected in the revision of 1923, in which we are told to begin with that Bergeret has two daughters.<sup>19</sup>

Certain additions had to be made to the articles in their rearrangement to gain greater coherency for the volume of 1897. Besides marginal emendations, there were two major additions. One is Chapter XIV, the short, satirical *Un Substitut* of 1894, which was added to *L'Orme* because the point of the story is exactly in har-

<sup>14</sup> The date 1897 was inserted in the reorganization for the edition of 1897.

<sup>15</sup> Anatole France, *op. cit.*, XI, 205.

<sup>16</sup> *Le Temps*, October 7, 1896.

<sup>17</sup> Anatole France, *L'Orme du mail* (Paris, January, 1897), p. 239.

<sup>18</sup> Anatole France, *Œuvres Complètes*, Carias edition (Paris, 1927), XI, 452.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.



mony with Bergeret's opinions on government, and probably also because France needed to fill out his book. To form a frame for that political apologue France wrote eight pages in-folio and distributed seven of them at the beginning and end of Chapter XIV. The eighth page forms the beginning of Chapter XV.<sup>20</sup> It is obvious where the additions begin and end.

The other major addition is in Chapter X. This chapter on Jeanne d'Arc is the article of April 2, 1895, the last before the article of April 21, 1896. Anatole France was incited to resume the theme of Jeanne d'Arc some twelve months later because during those twelve months a replica of her had appeared in Paris. To assure that the reader would project the modern charlatan's faults into the figure of Jeanne d'Arc, France wrote three articles in succession which he arranged skilfully as a frame for Chapter X. The first of these articles of 1896 he put in Chapter IX, and the other two comprise Chapter XI. France wrote two and a half pages in-folio at the end of Chapter X to form the transition between the prophetesses. When Bergeret calls Jeanne d'Arc "une mascotte," Lantaigne fails to hear him and offers a resounding prophecy on the Christian mission of France. "Aussi, répliqua M. Bergeret, voyons-nous paraître des prophétesses . . .," and the conversation then turns for one page to Claude Deniseau, forming an unsavory parallel with Jeanne d'Arc.<sup>21</sup> This page and a half, although written more than a year after Chapter X, thus neatly bridges the gap between the two prophetesses.

Again it seems clear that Anatole France in 1895, when he began the series of articles named *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, had no conception that they would expand into four volumes of *Histoire Contemporaine*.

The character whose growth testifies most fully to the unexpected development of the *Histoire Contemporaine* is Professor Bergeret. He is introduced with comparatively little characterization in Chapter VII. It is only little by little that Bergeret comes to be identified with his creator during the latter part of *L'Orme*, but particularly in *Le Mannequin d'osier*, which is largely the story of Anatole France himself. In *L'Anneau d'améthyste* France, as if Bergeret and he were only one person suffering from schizophrenia

<sup>20</sup> *Livres, Manuscrits, etc.*, pp. 105-106.

<sup>21</sup> Anatole France, *op. cit.*, XI, 105-6.

(and in a sense they are), moved the professor nearer to his author by promoting him and bringing him to Paris. There France could use him more effectively in his campaign for Dreyfus. This identification of Bergeret with Anatole France becomes so complete in the last two volumes that the author seems to forget he has been using the professor as a mouthpiece for his sentiments and, with no warning transition, Anatole France speaks directly for himself.<sup>22</sup>

It is impossible to offer certain proof in such a question, but the evidence indicates that none but the first few of these articles had been conceived before the series was started in 1895. The same evidence may help explain the hiatus of nearly thirteen months in the appearance of the articles, from April 2, 1895, to April 21, 1896.<sup>23</sup> It may be true, in conformance with the only explanation of this interruption so far proffered, that France ceased publication of his distinctly irreligious articles in order to grease the ways for launching himself into the Academy. That hypothesis can neither be proved nor disproved fully until more of his correspondence is known. France was elected to the French Academy on January 30, 1896, and was received into it on December 24, 1896.<sup>24</sup> It seems doubtful whether deference to the clerical members of the Academy could have deterred him for three months (from January 30 to April 21) from resuming the series if he had been eager to do it.

Another explanation seems more satisfactory. We have seen how amorphous in France's mind was the original conception of the articles. Proust gave evidence of this aimlessness of the series when he wrote to France:

Puis il y eut cette chose dont on ne savait pas d'abord si elle était une personne qui aurait sa permanence et son identité et qu'on appelait dans ce doute: 'L'article de *l'Echo*.' Et bientôt on put l'appeler les Bergeret.  
...<sup>25</sup>

It seems at least probable, then, that France quit the articles in April, 1895, simply because he had no particular subject to attract

<sup>22</sup> The first example of this personal intervention of France seems to be in *L'Anneau d'améthyste*. See Anatole France, *op. cit.*, XII, 183-184.

<sup>23</sup> See the chronological table of the articles. *Ibid.*, XI, 455-458.

<sup>24</sup> E. P. Dargan, *Anatole France* (New York, 1937), pp. 596-610.

<sup>25</sup> J. M. Pouquet, *Le Salon de Madame Arman de Caillavet* (Paris, 1926), pp. 193-194.

him and resumed them in April, 1896, as soon as the appearance of the seeress, Henriette Couédon, had given him an ideal subject to weave around his article on Jeanne d'Arc.

This study of the composition of *L'Orme du mail* leads us to two conclusions: when Anatole France began the articles called *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, he had planned only the first six or seven of them and did not know they would extend into four volumes of *Histoire Contemporaine*; the interruption of thirteen months in the appearance of the articles of *L'Orme* was probably due to the lack of a piquant subject, rather than to the author's election to the Academy.

D. L. HAMILTON

U. S. Naval Academy

---

#### VERSIONS BY SKELTON, CAXTON, AND BERNERS OF A PROLOGUE BY DIODORUS SICULUS

Caxton for the first three fourths of his prologue to the *Polycronicon*, 1482, and Lord Berners for the first two thirds of his prologue to Froissart's *Chronicles*, 1523, made translations from the first or general *Preface* to the *Library of History* by Diodorus Siculus.<sup>1</sup> This can be shown so readily that there is some wonder it has never been noticed before. The translations are not rigidly close, but close enough that even their sentence-structure is largely based on the source. That the two men translated their prologues without acknowledgement is nothing unusual.<sup>2</sup> The borrowed generalities upon the moral value of history, commonplaces in

<sup>1</sup> Caxton ed. by W. J. B. Crotch, *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (EETS os 176), London, 1928, pp. 64-67. Berners ed. by W. P. Ker, *The Chronicle of Froissart* (Tudor Translations, 27), London, 1901, pp. 3-7. Diodorus ed. by C. H. Oldfather (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1933, I, 4-13.

<sup>2</sup> Four others of Caxton's prologues are known to contain unavowed translation. (Parallel texts in Crotch, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 50, 71, 81.) Henry Watson's prologue to *The shyppes of fools*, 1509, was a translation of a translation, carefully altered in the proper names to fit Watson's new purpose. (Quoted by F. A. Pompen, *The English Versions of the Ship of Fools*, London, 1925, p. 282.) And see F. R. Amos, *Early Theories of Translation*, New York, 1920, pp. 43-46; and H. O. White, *Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance*, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, pp. 38-43.

Diodorus' time and so phrased as to sound commonplace at any time, became standard classical doctrine in Tudor England<sup>3</sup>; but it is doubtful if their incidental appearance with either the *Polycronicon* or the *Froissart* had much to do with implanting them. The chief interest of the common borrowing is in the opportunity to compare procedures of composition. The comparison can be the more telling because John Skelton included the same passage by Diodorus in his translation of the first five books of the *Library*, made not long before 1490.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Berners used the same version of Diodorus as had Skelton, Poggio's Latin translation,<sup>5</sup> while Caxton used either it or some French derivative of it; and none of the three translators was influenced by either of the others.<sup>6</sup>

Skelton's translation has been known as a vivid exhibition of the aureate style in English; and Caxton's enthusiasm for its 'polysshed and ornate termes,' as well as his restraint in his own practice, is a part of the history of that style.<sup>7</sup> But Lord Berners' use of the 'termes' has been severely blamed, and his prologue to his translation of Froissart has been made a conspicuous example of the early Tudor polished prologue.<sup>8</sup> The comparison of these three

<sup>3</sup> M. Kunz, *Zur Beurteilung der Prooemien in Diodors Historischer Bibliothek*, Diss., Zürich, 1935, pp. 61-62, 73-82. Lily B. Campbell, ed., *A Mirrour for Magistrates*, Cambridge, Mass., 1938, *Int.*, pp. 48-51.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 357 (Rotograph No. 29, Library of Congress, Modern Language Deposit), ff. 4r-6r.

<sup>5</sup> Made in 1449. No modern edition. My quotations are from the edition of Venice, 1476.

<sup>6</sup> Poggio's differences from Diodorus reappear in both Caxton and Berners. If Caxton used the Latin he translated more freely than I have seen him do elsewhere, including the unavowed matter in his other prologues. The earliest French translation I have found cited, that of Claude de Seyssell, c. 1515, was not made from Poggio (Paulin Paris, *Les MSS Français*, V, 414); but any fifteenth century French compiler or publisher of history may have found Diodorus' generalities as useful as did Caxton and Berners. Independence among the English versions is quickly established by collation.

<sup>7</sup> H. B. Lathrop, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman*, Madison, 1933, pp. 26-27.

<sup>8</sup> W. P. Ker, *op. cit.* *Int.*, pp. xii-xiii, xxxi-xxxii; G. E. B. Saintsbury, *History of English Prose Rythm*, London, 1912, pp. 94-96; G. P. Krapp, *The Rise of English Literary Prose*, New York, 1915, p. 316; J. A. Gee, *The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset*, New Haven, 1928, pp. 190-191; R. W. Chambers, *The Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School*, London, 1932, pp. cliv-clv.

men's treatment of the same text shows Caxton, indeed, less expansive and aureate than Skelton, but Berners far least so of all.

But first a description of the make-up of the borrowed prologues. That in Skelton's Diodorus, an avowed translation, is complete. Both Caxton and Berners, following their own purposes, left Diodorus at the point where he became specific about his own history; though at that point they both pretend, like Diodorus, that they were moved to publish or translate their respective chronicles by the preceding considerations of the value of history. The generalities comprise the first 550 words in Poggio's version.<sup>9</sup> Caxton's first 1150 words, or almost exactly three pages out of four, are translation. He begins on his own with the words,

Thenne syth historye is so precious & also prouffitable / J haue delybered to wryte twoo bookes . . .<sup>10</sup>

Near the beginning of the translation there is a passage of about 170 words which is entirely rewritten,<sup>11</sup> following the substance from Poggio's version but omitting and substituting many details, and only once reflecting any of the Latin phraseology.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the rest, though there are many changes in phraseology, there are only three additions and seven omissions in the sense, all isolated details.<sup>13</sup> Berners' first 850 words out of 1200 are translation. He has omitted a final ten words of generality in the Latin, used by Caxton, and beginning with the question,

What knowlege shulde we have of auneynt thynges past, and historie were nat?<sup>14</sup>

he has composed about 130 words of epithet, example, and apology apparently of his own. He ends the passage saying "I shall brevely come to a poynt," and the inconsistency of his thereupon resuming generalities is due to his brief return to Poggio for a transition:

<sup>9</sup> Ff. aii, v-aiii, v. Diodorus I. 1. 2.

<sup>10</sup> P. 66, l. 36.

<sup>11</sup> P. 64, ll. 19-32. Diod. I. 1. 3-4.

<sup>12</sup> ". . . totius orbis velut unius civitatis" : : "of alle the worlde as of one Cyte."

<sup>13</sup> The insertion of Nero as an example of a tyrant (p. 65, l. 23) is the only change worth mentioning.

<sup>14</sup> P. 5, ll. 18-20.



Advertentes igitur quanta laus scriptoris maneat . . .

Thus whan I advertysed and remembered . . . howe laudable and mertoryous a dede it is to write hystories . . .<sup>15</sup>

While adding only three details,<sup>16</sup> Berners omits or radically condenses three separate passages from Poggio, of one, four, and two sentences<sup>17</sup>; he epitomizes two others, of one sentence each;<sup>18</sup> and he freely re-arranges one other, of two sentences.<sup>19</sup>

Though less accurate than Skelton's in regard to the Latin constructions, Caxton's translation contains less sheer verbiage. Skelton's whole prologue—apparently the whole translation—is a heap of circumlocutions, some of them modest, many amazing. One could almost believe it to be a parody of the aureate style.<sup>20</sup> Caxton has used some periphrasis, but much of his redundancy consists of doublets and other small pleonasm; and while the cumulative effect is decidedly aureate, there remains a measurable difference from the aureate language of Skelton. For instance, between Caxton's "conseruatryce and kepar"<sup>21</sup> and Skelton's "chief defensyf wardeyne & contynuel preserver," for *custodem*, there is, of course, the difference of sheer quantity. But frequently it is more than that: between "vnlerned and brutyssh peple" by Caxton<sup>22</sup> and "alle other that bereyn be & naked of doctryne" by Skelton, both for *indoctis*, the difference becomes one of kind. For Skelton has used periphrasis, not merely a doublet; and the weight of the verbal group thus formed is that of a sentence-member or

<sup>15</sup> P. 5, ll. 31, ff.

<sup>16</sup> "a thousande yere" (p. 3, l. 18), "four or fyve hundred yere" (p. 4, l. 12), and "duke Theseus" (p. 4, l. 40).

<sup>17</sup> Diod. i. l. 2; Caxton p. 64, ll. 11-14. Diod. i. 2. 2-4; Caxton p. 65, l. 36—p. 66, l. 7. Diod. i. 2. 5-6; Caxton p. 66, ll. 19-25.

<sup>18</sup> Berners p. 4, l. 39—p. 5, l. 2; Diod. i. 2. 4; Caxton p. 66, ll. 11-14. Berners p. 5, ll. 9-10; Diod. i. 2. 7; Caxton p. 66, ll. 27-29.

<sup>19</sup> Berners p. 4, ll. 15-24; Diod. i. l. 3 entire; Caxton p. 64, ll. 19-28 (also freely treated).

<sup>20</sup> For instance, "Hercules . . . dum vixit . . ." becomes "Hercules whiles he in this lyf present endured . . ." (Caxton, p. 66, l. 8, "Hercules whan he lyued . . ."; Berners, p. 4, l. 36, ". . . Hercules . . . in his lyfe.") "Plurimum proficit ad rectam vitam" becomes "hyghly she profyteth in conductyng us unto the strayt way of sensyble understandyng." (Caxton, p. 66, l. 35, "moche prouffytyn vnto a ryghtful lif"; Berners omits.)

<sup>21</sup> P. 66, l. 18.

<sup>22</sup> P. 66, l. 22.

*colon*. Disregarding the recast passage, which is hard to measure, Caxton's translation shows only eleven such verbal groups, whereas in parallel context Skelton has twenty. At the same time, Caxton remains at least equal to Skelton in the form of his sentences. Neither his inaccuracies nor his redundancies cause any broad change from the pattern of sentence-structure laid down by Poggio. With the exceptions just mentioned the number of sentence-members is the same as in Poggio; and their division, order, and inter-relationship are roughly the same, often very nearly the same. Structurally the prose is firmer, more accurate, and more patterned than that in any of Caxton's original writing. Within this very prologue the difference may be observed, Caxton's typical looseness beginning at the point where he gave over his source and began on his own.<sup>23</sup>

Berners most often omitted from, epitomized, or rearranged the context of the source, clearly feeling free to do what he liked. But in 700 of the 850 words he translated the sentence-structure is closely based upon that in Poggio, usually more closely than Caxton's translation. The real firmness of his sentences, and their variety and aptness, are likely to be overlooked because of his famous strings of synonyms.<sup>24</sup> Doublets, however, are practically his only form of aureate language, more conspicuous because his phraseology is in other ways terse and direct. He has made only five verbal groups of the kind described above in Skelton, and only two of these seem more amplified than is natural to open translation.<sup>25</sup> The most pervasive element in the aureate style—and the most vitiating—was periphrasis. It must be noted of Berners, who

<sup>23</sup> For this reason I had suspected that the first three pages of this prologue are translation for some time before I realized what is the source.

<sup>24</sup> The clumsiness of the sentence quoted by Gee, *loc. cit.*, came about when Berners got lost in his Latin, the one time in the prologue that he did: "Et enim caetera monumenta ad parum tempus produrant variis casibus disturbata. historiae virtus pro universum orbem diffusa: ipsum: quod caetera consumit: tempus custodem sui habet." Cf. Berners p. 5, ll. 2-7.

<sup>25</sup> "probos" : : "suche as ben noble and vertuous" (p. 5, l. 16); "improbos" : : "suche as ben wicked, yvell, and reprovablen" (p. 5, l. 17). The others (p. 3, l. 12, p. 4, ll. 19-20) are of the following order (p. 4, ll. 21-22): "propter laudem: quae mortuos sequitur" : : "for the great laude that they have after they ben deed."

was still in the tradition of the fifteenth century, that by minimizing his use of periphrasis he directly differed from his predecessors.

The same difference appears if Berners is compared with other predecessors, with Lydgate, Atkynson, or Barclay, for instance. Poggio's Latin provides an exact basis, however, for a comparison with Skelton and Caxton. The translations of the following passage are as nearly average for all three as can be obtained for paralleling:

*Denique litterarum monumentis: quae testimonium virtuti praebent: moti quidam tum condidere civitates: tum leges utiles vitae mortalium ediderunt. Nonnulli novarum artium doctrinarumque inventores ad usum gentium extitere. Sed omnium rerum: quibus faelicitas hominis paratur: laudem praecipuam causamque historiae tribui decet. Est enim custos eorum: quae cum virtute acta sunt: testem se malefactis benificamque erga omne genus hominum praebens.*<sup>26</sup>

*Skelton:* And some thrugh the motyf of litterature whiche maketh a due probate & testymonye moeved / have as wel edyfyed famous cytees / as they have assigned laudable decrees & grounded lawes unto the behoef of mannes temporal lyf / And some by crafty invencion of new faittes & doctryne have founde benefycial pollicyes for the wele in comyn / But the singuler laude & comendacion in espescyall of alle mater / wher thrugh worldly welth may be enioyed / & the most chief & soverayn causatyf thereof / ought to be ascribed unto historyal processe / It is the sure garnyson of alle suche thyngis that by vertue be wrought & perfourmed / offryng hym self in testimonial unto mysgrayded & undisposed persones / Exhibytyng hym self bounteous toward alle maner of people.<sup>27</sup>

*Caxton:* Truly many of hye and couragious men of grete empayse / desyryng theyr fame to be perpetuely conseruyd by lyberal [*sic*] monumentis / whiche ben the permanente recordes of euery vyrtuose and noble Acte / haue buylded and edefyed ryall and noble Cytees / And for the conseruacion of the wele publycke haue mynystred and establysshed dyscrete and prouffitable lawes / And thus the pryncipal laude / and cause of delectable and amyable thynges / in whiche mannes felycyte stondesth and resteth ought and maye wel be attributed to hystories / whiche worde historye may be descryued thus / Historye is a perpetuel conseruatryce of thoos thynges / that haue be doone before this presente tyme / and also a cotydyan wytnesse of bienfayttes of malefaytes / grete Actes / and tryumphal vycitoryes of all maner peple.<sup>28</sup>

*Berners:* So thus, through the monumentes of writyng, which is the testimony unto vertue, many men have ben moved, some to bylde cytes, some to devyse and establishe lawes right profitable, necessarie, and behove-

<sup>26</sup> Fol. aiii, r. Diod. i. 2. 1-2.

<sup>27</sup> Fol. 5, r.

<sup>28</sup> P. 65, ll. 23-36.

full for the humayne lyfe; some other to fynde new artes, craftes, and sciences, very requisyte to the use of mankynde. But above all thynges, wherby mans welthe ryseth, speciall laude and cause<sup>29</sup> ought to be gyven to historie: it is the keper of suche thinges as have ben vertuously done, and the wytnesse of yvell dedes: and by the benefite of hystorie all noble, highe, and vertuous actes be immortal.<sup>30</sup>

SAMUEL K. WORKMAN

*Northwestern University*

### A METRICAL PUZZLE IN THE *MIRROR FOR MAGISTRATES*

The 1578 edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates* exhibits a large number of textual variants. Like that of 1571, this edition was "newly corrected," with what Miss Lily B. Campbell calls "an enthusiasm for change which it is hard to explain. Very often neither rhyme nor reason is improved by the corrections introduced."<sup>1</sup>

Attention has not been called, I think, to a peculiarity in the nature of the 1578 variants in the third tragedy of the *Mirror*, the tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester. As the following scansion shows, in the 1559 edition this poem was written in a loose, alliterative verse of four stresses:

- L. 1: Whose státe is stáblisht in sémyng most sùre,  
And so fár from dáunger of Fórtunes blást,  
24: A more róyall ráce was nót vnder héauen,  
More stówte or more státely of stómacke and péron,

According to the collation in Miss Campbell's edition, the 1578 version of the *Mirror* introduced twenty variants in the two hundred and three lines of this tragedy. Placed beside their originals in earlier editions, all but one of these variants are seen to be, in effect, substitutions of a five-stress line, usually iambic, for an earlier four-stress line.

<sup>29</sup> So in Pynson's ed., 1523. Ker emended to *praise*.

<sup>30</sup> P. 4, ll. 25-35. The last 14 words are a condensation of 80 words in Poggio following the passage quoted.

<sup>1</sup> Lily B. Campbell, ed., *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 18.

- L. 1: Whose state stablisht is, in semyng most sure,<sup>a</sup>  
 Who stablisht is in State, seeming most sure,  
 10: Addrest in presence his fate to complayne,  
 Prest in presence on Fortune to complayne,  
 12: Extracte by discent from the royall stocke,  
 Who by discent was of the royall stocke,  
 64: Thus hoysted so high on Fortunes wheele,  
 Thus hoysted high on Fortunes whyrling wheele,  
 135: After we had these myracles wrought,  
 After we had these Myracles thus wrought,  
 137: That to suche bondage he should be brought,  
 By Subiectes thus in bondage to bee brought,  
 142: with former matter his yre to renue:  
 with former cause of rancour to renue:  
 147: Their wages to claime when the town was solde.  
 To claime their wages, when the town was solde.  
 149: Hourded in his harte hate out of measure,  
 Fulfylde his hart with hate out of measure,  
 152: But loue dayes dissembled do neuer endure,  
 But Frenship fayned, in prooffe is found vnure.  
 158: Where it hath had long season to brewe,  
 Where it hath not had long season to brewe,  
 170: By reason of syckenes whiche helde me full sore:  
 With long sicknesse diseased very sore:  
 172: with whom I confedered in bande before,  
 with whom I was confedered before,  
 195: whiche by this facte preparedst the waye,  
 whiche by this facte preparedst a playne waye,  
 200: For looke what measure we other awarde,  
 For looke what measure to others we awarde,

Fifteen of the twenty variants in this tragedy convert four-stress lines into fairly normal iambic five-stress lines. Since the variants do not reveal the degeneration of text usually observable in reprints, one can hardly explain them as unintentional. Since they make little difference in the thought of the passages,<sup>a</sup> it

<sup>a</sup>In all the pairs of lines cited, the second is that of the 1578 edition. The first is that of the 1574 edition, which (except in line 38) has the same reading as that of the 1571 edition, which in turn (except in lines 1, 147, and 149) has the same reading as that of the 1559 edition.

<sup>b</sup>The addition of *not* reverses the meaning of line 158, thus deteriorating the "reason" of the text; but the change, shown by the context to be



appears probable that the intention was a metrical one. Four of the remaining five variants apparently result from the same intent, but they show a wrenching of the earlier lines to achieve an approximation of iambic pentameter in the 1578 edition.

- L. 9: To hearken awhyle to Thomas of Wudstocke,  
Turne thine eare to Thomas of Wudstocke,  
38: And most false of fayth where I most affyed:  
And most false fayth where I most affyed:  
145: To axe a reckening of the Realmes reuenue:  
To aske accoumpt of the Realmes reuenue:  
189: As execucion doen before iudgement.  
As execution to goe before iudgement.

These lines are not good iambic pentameters; but they eliminate most of the trisyllabic feet of the earlier versions and in other ways represent changes toward iambic pentameter. They are scarcely less regular, indeed, than many iambic pentameters of other tragedies in the *Mirror* and than many by the less facile among English versifiers of the 1570's generally.

The other variant, the substitution of *assuraunce* for *esperaunce* in line 74, seems to be without metrical significance; and for it I have here no explanation. On the basis of nineteen out of twenty variants we are forced to conclude, therefore, that though neither rhyme nor reason may be improved by these variants, it was most probably someone's intention that the rhythm be "improved" by them. Whether the person or persons responsible for the text of this edition failed to understand the metrics of this tragedy or deliberately avoided the old four-stress line is speculative. The distribution of these variants in the several stanzas<sup>4</sup> precludes the hypothesis that an effort was made to invent a stanza form combining iambic pentameter with four-stress alliterative verse.

Why someone rewrote these nineteen lines as iambic and allowed one hundred eighty-three other lines to stand I can not explain. To a modern ear, most of those which were not changed are clearly four-stress lines, but a considerable number of them contain ten

obviously incorrect, can hardly have been introduced for its effect upon the thought.

<sup>4</sup> The iambic lines occupy each of the seven positions within the stanza. Two are first lines; five, second; two, third; five, fourth; three, fifth; one, sixth; two, seventh.

syllables and in another context might pass for iambics.<sup>5</sup> Yet it seems hardly likely that the writer regarded as iambic all of the lines he did not alter. The textual variants in the 1578 version of the tragedy of Thomas of Gloucester constitute a puzzle in metrics. The 1578 edition of the *Mirror* exhibits this peculiarity in no other tragedy of the nineteen tragedies which made up the 1559 *Mirror*. Until further evidence is obtained, the tempting hypothesis that the 1578 version of this tragedy had another authorship than that of the rest of the 1578 *Mirror*, must, however, be rejected.

WILLIAM PEERY

*University of North Carolina*

---

### THE ELIZABETHAN IDEA OF MELANCHOLY

In recent years, scholars have rediscovered the Elizabethan "science" of psychology; and they have brought its technical and puzzling terms to the interpretation of the great figures of the Shakespearean drama. Hamlet and Jaques, we have been told, provided no problems for the people of the sixteenth century, who knew the exact medical significance of each action and word of the two melancholics.

The proponents of this view draw particularly upon the work of Dr. Timothy Bright, from whom, in their opinion, we may learn the attitude of the average Elizabethan towards melancholy. One scholar, for example, declares:

Thus, in the light of Bright's *Treatise* we get the outlines of a Hamlet of Elizabethan psychology. This Hamlet is not a puppet of dramatic circumstance, pulled now by Kyd's strings and now by Shakespeare's, but a character unified by the qualities of the melancholy man, as Bright presents them.<sup>1</sup>

Despite its apparent logic and rightness, however, the theory that Shakespeare based the characters of Hamlet and Jaques upon the pseudopsychology of his own day is open to serious objection.

<sup>5</sup> E. g., line 2, And so far from daunger of Fortunes blast; line 3, As by the compas of mans coniecture; line 4, No brasen pyller maye be fyxt more fast; etc.

<sup>1</sup> Mary Isabelle O'Sullivan, "Hamlet and Dr. Timothy Bright," *PMLA*, xli (1926), 667-679.

Professor E. E. Stoll has protested vigorously against "the disturbing intrusion of antiquarian learning into the interpretation of Shakespeare's characters, the substitution of Elizabethan textbook physiology or psychology for our contemporary sort."<sup>2</sup> And it is true that there is no evidence that Bright's ideas were shared by the majority of the Elizabethans or even by Shakespeare himself. Such technical textbook terms as "melancholy adust" and others, on which modern scholars lean heavily, are nowhere to be found in the works of Shakespeare. If we are to interpret his characters in the light of Elizabethan psychology, we must first demonstrate that the theatrical audience of his time was thoroughly familiar with the particular type of psychology we choose to apply.

For knowledge of what the Elizabethans, generally, thought about melancholy, we must turn, not to "scientific" writers like Bright, but to such productions as the sermons and treatises of popular preachers. It is in a work by one of the most famous of Puritan divines that we find an exhaustive analysis of melancholy:

Many are of opinion that this sorrowe for sinne is nothing els but a melancholike passion: but in trueth the thing is farre otherwise, as may appeare in the example of David: who by all coniectures was least troubled with melancholie, and yet never any tasted more deeply of the sorrowe and feeling of Gods anger for sinne than he did, as the booke of Psalmes declareth. And if any desire to know the difference, they are to bee discerned thus. Sorrowe for sinne may bee where health, reason, senses, memorie and all are sound: but Melancholike passions are where the bodie is unsound, and the reason, senses, memorie, dulled and troubled. Secondly, sorrowe for sinne is not cured by any phisicke, but onely by the sprinkling of the blood of Iesus Christ: Melancholike passions are remoued by phisicke, diet, musicke and such like. Thirdly, sorrowe for sinne riseth of the anger of God, that woundeth and pierceth the conscience: but Melancholike passions rise onely of meere imaginations strongly conceived in the braine. Lastly, these passions are long in breeding, and come by little and little: but the sorrowe for sinne usually commeth on a sudden as lightening into a house. And yet howsoever they are differing, it must bee acknowledged that they may both concurre together: so that the same man which is troubled with Melancholie, may feelee also the anger of God for sinne.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> E. E. Stoll, "Jaques and the Antiquaries," *MLN.*, LIV, (1939), 79-85.

<sup>3</sup> William Perkins, *A Treatise Tending / Unto A Declaration, Whether A Man Be In the Estate / of damnation, or in the estate of grace . . . / . . .*, London / Printed by the Widowe Orwin, for / Iohn Porter, 1597, p. 40, sig. Cc6v.

The "melancholike passion" described by Perkins is close to that described by Bright, but it has been shorn of all subtle distinctions and technical verbiage. It is, probably, as close as we can get to the average Elizabethan's conception of melancholy.

SIDNEY THOMAS

*College of the City of New York*

### CYME, A PURGATIVE DRUG

In attempting to identify some herbs mentioned in Middleton's *Witch*, I discovered that the *O. E. D.* does not define *sium*. According to Gerard, the English term for *sium* is *wild parsley*, and he describes what he calls the "vertues" of this herb with these words:

The root being chewed, bringeth  
by the mouth flegme out of the  
head, and is a remedy for the  
toothache, and there is no doubt  
but that it also maketh thin,  
cutteth and openeth, provoketh  
vrine, and bringeth down the  
flowers & doth likewise no less  
but more effectually perform  
those things which the rest of  
the Parsleyes do.<sup>1</sup>

Could this *sium* be the *Cyme* which Shakespeare defines as a "purgative drug" in the words of Macbeth (v, iii, 55-6):

What Rubarb, Cyme, or what Purgatiue drugge  
Would scowre these English hence:

could *cyme* spell *sium*? It must be understood that I am not suggesting an emendation of the text. If the text needs emendation, surely nothing more logical could be suggested than Mr. A. R. Dunlap's reading *Tyme* (that is, *thyme*) instead of *Cyme*.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Dunlap clearly indicates, by the citation of pertinent quotations from Elizabethan and Jacobean herbals, that some of Shakespeare's

<sup>1</sup> John Gerard, *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes* (London, 1597), p. 867.

<sup>2</sup> A. R. Dunlap, "What Purgative Drug?," *MLN.*, LIV (1939), 92-4.

contemporaries considered thyme to be a purgative. He likewise comments on the undoubted fact that *c* or *C* is easily mistaken for *t* or *T* in Elizabethan handwriting. The only objections that could be made to this emendation are: (1) although some of Shakespeare's contemporaries considered thyme to be a purgative, he himself never spoke of it as such; in fact, it seems almost impossible to use a word which has a connotation of catharsis in such a passage as

I know a banke where the wilde time blowes,  
Where Oxslips and the nodding Violet growes,  
Quite oucr-cannoped with luscious woodbine,  
With sweet muske roses, and with Eglantine;<sup>3</sup>

and (2) although *t* and *c* are easily mistaken in Elizabethan handwriting, they are no more easily mistaken than many other possible combinations of letters. These objections, are of course, nothing more than quibbles, and if an emendation is required, Mr. Dunlap's suggestion is quite the best so far.

What this paper would like to propose tentatively is that the line in question (*Macbeth*, V, iii, 55) was printed correctly in the First Folio. After all, the most erudite emendation rests on much less secure foundations of *possible* existence than the *actually* existing text. Or, if a unique word is too much to expect from Shakespeare in this context, it seems not impossible that the compositor here—as he seems to have done many times elsewhere<sup>4</sup>—heard the word he saw written in the author's manuscript and (with a memory of the sound, rather than the sight of what the author wrote) set the type as we now find it.

FRANK SULLIVAN

St. Louis University

---

#### SOME UNPUBLISHED VERSES BY THOMAS RANDOLPH

Many of Thomas Randolph's poems omitted from the incomplete posthumous editions of 1638 and 1640 may have been lost beyond recovery with the disappearance of the manuscript volume

<sup>3</sup> *MND.*, II, i, 249-52.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. William Blades, "Common Typographical Errors with Special Reference to the Text of Shakespeare," *Athenaeum*, 1872, I, 114.



circumstantially described by William Oldys in the annotated *Langbaine*:

Old Counsellor Fane of Colchester, who in *Forma Pauperis* deceived me of a good sum of money which he owed me, and not long after set up his chariot, gave me a parcel of MSS. and promised me among others (which he never gave me, nor anything else, besides a barrel of oysters) a MS. copy of Randolph's poems, an original, as he said, with many additions never printed, being devolved to him as the author's relation.<sup>1</sup>

Lacking such an "original," Randolph's modern editors have found the establishment of a complete and accurate canon a difficult task. A few of the previously omitted poems, preserved in the manuscript anthologies of Randolph's period, have been identified and published in the editions of W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1875) and John Jay Parry (New Haven, 1917); and the Randolph canon has been further enlarged by the researches of the late Professor G. C. Moore Smith,<sup>2</sup> most of whose discoveries were incorporated in the edition of G. Thorn-Drury (London, 1929). To this body of material I am able to add, from a contemporary manuscript, three small pieces whose authenticity is vouched for not only by the compiler's ascription—which in itself might not be conclusive—but also by their close relation to Randolph's unquestioned work.

The manuscript, *HM172* in the Henry E. Huntington Library, is a quarto volume now containing thirty-two leaves (a number have been lost) in an unidentified secretary hand of the first half of the seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> It contains forty-nine poems, with or without attribution, by Cominius, Dr. Alabaster, Thomas Freeman, Francis Bacon, Dr. Henry King, Thomas Randolph, Thomas Carew, Robert Thompson, Gervaise Wermestrie, James Shirley, Dr. Richard Corbet, Ben Jonson, and others; those which may be taken as Randolph's are as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Transcribed by G. Thorn-Drury, in *Poems of Thomas Randolph* (London, 1929), p. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> See his articles in *Palaestra*, CXLVIII (1925), 244-257, and *RES*, I (1925), 319-320; and his Warton Lecture in English Poetry, *Thomas Randolph* (British Academy, London, 1927).

<sup>3</sup> De Ricci and Wilson, in their *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, I, 61, give the provenance as follows: Sold by Thorpe (Cat., 1836, n. 1035) to Sir T. Phillipps (n. 10110); his sale (London, 1895, n. 903) to Quaritch; Robert Hoe sale (New York, 1911, I, n. 2177) to G. D. Smith. Items from this manuscript are reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library.

I. (fols. 5<sup>v</sup>-6<sup>v</sup>) *On a very deformed Gentlewoman, but of a voice incomparably sweete* ("I chanc'd sweete Lesbia's voyce to heare"), unsigned.

II. (fol. 6<sup>v</sup>) *In eandem Dysticon*, and same *Englischd* (both printed below), signed Tho: Randolph.

III. (fols. 10<sup>v</sup>-14<sup>r</sup>) *His complaynt on Cupid that hee never yet made him enamored* ("How many of thy Captives, Love Complayne"), signed Tho: Randolph.

IV. (fol. 14<sup>r</sup>) *The song of Discord* ("Lett Linus and Amphions lute"), signed Tho: Randolph.

V. (fol. 14<sup>r-v</sup>) *The Masque of vices* ("Say in a dance, how shall wee goe"), signed Tho: Randolphe.

VI. (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>) *In Archimedis Sphaeram. ex Claudiano* ("Jove, sawe the Heavens form'd in a little glasse"), signed Tho: Randolph.

VII. (fols. 14<sup>v</sup>-15<sup>r</sup>) "When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse" (printed below), signed Tho: Randolphe.

VIII. (fols. 22<sup>r</sup>-24<sup>v</sup>) *Of an inæstimable content hee enioyes in the Muses, to those of his freindes, that dehort him from Poetry* ("Goe sordid earth, and hope not to bewitch"), signed Tho: Randolph.

IX. (fol. 24<sup>v</sup>) *De moderatione Animi in vtrâq; fortunâ* (printed below), signed Tho: Randolph.

Of these pieces, nos. I, III, IV, VI, and VIII were included in Randolph's posthumous *Poems* of 1638, and no. V appears, as a "Song and Dance," in his *Muses Looking-glasse* of the same year. The only significant variants in the manuscript version of these authenticated poems occur in no. I; here the extra couplet

Then would I wedd with Giges ring  
And turne all eare, to heare the sing;

is interpolated after line 68, and the four concluding lines appear as

But love or hate must in mee rise,  
While shee hath voice or I have eyes:  
If not, you Godes to ease my mynde,  
Or make her dumbe, or strike mee blinde.

Thorn-Drury<sup>4</sup> mentions similar variants in the text of this poem

<sup>4</sup> Thorn-Drury, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

from other transcripts, of which he knew "more than a dozen." He also prints a Latin distich, different from no. II in the present manuscript, as sometimes accompanying it.

No. II, the first of the new verses, is itself a mere pendant to the lines on the "Deformed Gentlewoman," which it immediately follows:

In eandem Dysticon.

*Vox Helenam, vultus Hecubam te Lesbia clamat:*

*Vox (mihi namq3 places) Incipe, forma tace*

Englished.

By thy lookes Hecuba, Helen by thy song,  
Lett thy voyce speake, bidd thy face hold her tongue.

Tho: Randolph.

No. VII also stands in close relation to one of Randolph's established works, the translation of Claudian's "Iuppiter in parvo cum cerneret aethera vitro"—a translation which it succeeds in the present manuscript, and from which it derives its theme:

When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse,  
Wherein each orbe, each Spheare, each motion was,  
His wisdom hee condemnes, that would impart  
To such a brittle mettle so much Art.  
Jove doe not that in Archimedis blame,  
Which fault in thy creation is the same,  
The matter of thy greater world all see,  
Like his is nothing but fragilitie.

Tho: Randolphe.

Finally, the six lines of prudential advice constituting no. IX may logically be associated with Randolph's thirty-seven rhymed "Precepts"—religious, moral, and practical—published in the *Poems* of 1638 under the general title "Necessary observations":

*De moderatione Animi in vtrâq3 fortunâ.*

Is thy poore Barke becalm'd? and forc'd to stay  
A prisoner fetter'd vpp in a dead Sea?  
Spight of the threatens, that desperation bringes,  
Bidd her at large spredd forth her canvas winges,  
In expectation of a happier gale,  
But when thy winde blowes faire, contract her saile.

Tho: Randolph.

This well-worn morality finds more eloquent expression in a long

speech assigned to "golden" Mediocritie in *The Muses Looking-glasse*.<sup>5</sup>

None of these verses will add much to Randolph's stature as a poet. Neither the Latin distich nor its English rendering—though Randolph's contemporaries may have found there some crumb of "wit"—is likely to delight the modern reader, and the *De moderatione Animi* sounds like very youthful rhyming. A little more may, perhaps, be claimed for no. VII; its conceit is skilfully shaped, and the theme of the world's fragility is nowadays a pregnant one.

RHODES DUNLAP

State University of Iowa

---

#### THOMAS CAREW, THOMAS CAREY, AND "THE SOVEREIGN OF THE SEAS"

In the volume of *Minor Poets of the 17th Century* which he edited for Everyman's Library in 1931, Mr. R. G. Howarth printed (p. 166) for the first time among the poems of Thomas Carew a sixteen-line poem "Upon the Royal Ship called the 'Sovereign of the Seas' built by Peter Pett, Master Builder; his Father, Captain Phineas Pett, Supervisor: 1637," from Additional MS. 34,217, fol. 29, in the British Museum. This manuscript contains Latin and English versions of the poem, the Latin signed "Hen: Jacob" and the English "Tho: Carew."<sup>1</sup> Another copy, with similar ascriptions to Jacob and Carew, is listed in the *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, x, 4, p. 21, as among MSS. of the Earl of Westmoreland; and a third copy appears in the upper corners of John Payne's engraving, issued in 1637 or 1638, "The true portraictvire of his Ma.<sup>ties</sup> royall ship The Sovereigne of the Seas."<sup>2</sup> In Payne's text the Latin verses, which begin

<sup>5</sup> Ed. 1638, pp. 86-89.

<sup>1</sup> The signatures are in different hands from that of the copyist. Comparison of the "Tho: Carew" with Thomas Carew's authenticated signatures in the Oxford University Subscription Register (1608) and in three letters (1616) at the Public Record Office (S. P. 14/88:67, 77, and 87) is inconclusive, since the differences which appear could conceivably have developed in Carew's hand during the long interval from 1616 to 1637.

<sup>2</sup> For a contemporary account of the vessel which evoked the verses and

"*Scilicet Octauo stupeant Miracula nostro,*" are subscribed "Henr. Iacob"; the English verses appear as follows:

Triton's auspicious Sound usher Thy raigne  
O're the curl'd billowes, Royal SOVERAINE,  
Monarchal Ship; whose Fabrick doth outpride  
The Pharos, Colosse, Memphique Pyramide:  
And seemes a moouing Towre, when sprightly gales  
Quicknen the motion, and embreath the sailes.  
Wee y<sup>t</sup> haue heard of SEAVEN, now see y<sup>e</sup> EIGHT  
Wonder at home; of Nauall art the height.  
This Britain ARGO putts down that of Greece  
Be-Deck't with more then one rich Golden Fleece  
Wrought into Sculptures, which Emblemazize  
Pregnant Concept to the more Curious eyes.  
Neptune is proud o'th burden, and doth wonder  
To heare a Fourefold Fire out-rore Ioue's Thunder.  
Onn then Triumphant Arke, with EDGAR's fame,  
To CHARLES his Scepter add y<sup>e</sup> Trident's claime.  
Tho: Cary.

The author of the Latin verses is identifiable as "Henry Jacob . . . the prodigie of his age for Philological and Oriental learning," who, according to Wood, "spent some time with the famous *Selden*, an. 1636. in composing a book. . . . At which time, as 'tis said, he taught, or at least improved, *Selden* in the Hebrew Language."<sup>3</sup> Jacob was, after 1629, a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, where Thomas Carew had at an earlier time (1608-1611) been a student; he translated into Latin verse Carew's poem "Ingratefull beauty threatned";<sup>4</sup> and the two men may well have known each other. But it is not necessary to assume that the

engraving see Thomas Heywood's *A true Discription of his Majesties royall and most stately Ship called the Sovereign of the Seas, built at Wolwitch in Kent 1637*, published 1637; this contains a poem on the ship by Shackerley Marmion, besides an "Epigrammaticall rapture" of Heywood's own. Sir Richard Fanshawe also has Latin and English verses on the subject, printed with his translation of *Il Pastor Fido*, 1647; and "A salutation of his Majesties Ship the Sovereign" appears in Henry King's *Poems, Elegies, Paradoxes, and Sonnets*, 1657. Payne's engraving is noticed in the second issue of Heywood's volume (1638).

<sup>3</sup> Anthony à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (1691), II, 89. See also Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College* (Oxford Historical Society, 1885), pp. 285-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Philologiæ Ἀνακαλυπτήριον Oratione celebratum Inaugurali, Quam publice habuit ad Oxonio-Mertonenses Henricus Iacobius* (1652), p. 47.

Thomas Carew or Cary who wrote the English verses on "The Sovereign of the Seas" was Thomas Carew, author of "A Rapture." The names Carew, Carey, and Cary are practically interchangeable in seventeenth-century usage, and there were at least two other "poetical" Thomas Careys writing at the same time as Thomas Carew. The better-known Thomas Carey, born in 1597, second son of the Earl of Monmouth and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Charles I, was the author of verses incorrectly attributed to Thomas Carew by W. C. Hazlitt (1870) and J. W. Ebsworth (1893);<sup>5</sup> he died, however, in 1634, too early to have been the author of the present poem. The other Thomas Cary was the translator of Puget de la Serre's *The Mirrour which Flatters Not*, 1639. He was born at Tower Hill, the son of Allen Cary, gentleman, had his schooling at Tower Hill, and on March 13, 1622/23, at the age of seventeen, was admitted as Fellow-Commoner at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. He graduated B. A. in 1625/26, was admitted to Gray's Inn on Jan. 29, 1626/27, and on Dec. 21, 1629 was appointed Gentleman Porter of the Tower.<sup>6</sup> James Howell addressed to him one of the letters (a New Year's missive) in the *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae*.<sup>7</sup> Thomas Cary of Tower Hill was a dogged but uninspired poet. His mannerisms and degree of competence as a versifier may be indicated by an excerpt from the valedictory couplets which he published with his translated *Mirrour*:

So, now 'tis done, although it be no Taske,  
That did much Braines, or toylesome Study aske:  
The meaning I 'vouch good, but Merit small,  
In rendring English, the FRENCH PRINCIPALL:  
It is but a Translation I confesse,  
And yet the Rubs of Death in't nerethesle  
May trippe some cap'ring Fancies of the Time,  
That Domineere, and Swagger it in Rime,  
That Charge upon the Reader, and give Fire.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> These confusions were set straight by Arthur Vincent in his edition of *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (Muses' Library), pp. xxvii-xxxi.

<sup>6</sup> John and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I, i, 272; Rymer, *Foedera*, XIX, 133.

<sup>7</sup> James Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae* (ed. Jacobs, 1890), pp. 627-8: "To Mr. T. C., at his House upon Tower-hill."

<sup>8</sup> *The Mirrour which Flatters Not* (1639), sig. Q8.



There are forty-eight lines of this, matching those on "The Sovereign of the Seas" in their labored style and poetic mediocrity. Thomas Carew wrote nothing at all similar. And external evidence corroborates this judgment, for whereas the acquaintance (and thus the possible collaboration) of Thomas Carew with Henry Jacob is entirely hypothetical, Thomas Cary's *The Mirrour which Flatters Not* contains a set of complimentary verses in English, Latin, and Greek, headed "To my endeared Friend, the Translator, Mr Thomas Cary" and signed by Henry Jacob.

RHODES DUNLAP

State University of Iowa

---

### BURTON, BACON, AND SANDYS

A study of the successive editions of Burton's great work, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, constitutes one of the most fascinating problems of seventeenth-century scholarship. It is possible to observe in the various changes the growth of Burton's mind, his aliveness to new information, and his constant perusal of sources, ancient and modern. Like so many of his contemporaries, he seems to have been especially aware of the current news about foreign lands supplied by the numerous travel books of his period.

At some time between the third edition (1628) and the fourth (1632), Burton<sup>1</sup> decided to insert into a section on "Alteratives and Cordials" an interesting passage on a new restorative drink:

The Turkes have a drinke called *Coffa* (for they use no wine) so named of a berry as blacke as soot, and as bitter, (like that blacke drinke which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians* and perhaps the same) which they sip still of, and sup as warme as they can suffer; they spend much time in those *Coffa*-houses, which are somewhat like our Alehouses and Tavernes, and there they sit chatting and drinking to drive away the time, and to bee merry together, because they finde by experience that kinde of drinke so used helpeth digestion, and procureth alacrity. Some of them take opium to this purpose.

This, as it happens, was the passage that troubled Paul Jordan-Smith<sup>2</sup> because he had to concede that even Ignatius Donnelly had

<sup>1</sup> *Anat. of Mel.*, fol. Ccc4.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Jordan-Smith, *Bibliographia Burtoniana: A Study of Robert Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Palo Alto, 1931), pp. 76-77.

here a seemingly tenable argument; Donnelly had exultantly pointed to a remarkably similar passage in Bacon's *Natural History*:<sup>3</sup>

They have in Turkey a drink called *coffa*, made of a berry of the same name, as black as soot, and of a strong scent, but not aromatical; which they take, beaten into powder, in water, as hot as they can drink it: and they take it, and sit at it in their coffa-houses, which are like our taverns. This drink comforteth the brain and heart, and helpeth digestion. Certainly this berry coffa, the root and leaf betel, the leaf tobacco, and the tear of poppy (opium), of which the Turks are great takers (supposing it expelleth all fear), do all condense the spirits, and make them strong and aleger.

Donnelly's *The Great Cryptogram*<sup>4</sup> concludes: "We find both writers treating of the same subject, in the same language, with the same ideas, and even falling into the same error, that is, to say that the coffee berry is 'as black as soot.'" The conclusion, then, is inescapable: the two passages were written by the same hand.

Some years before either Burton or Bacon wrote, George Sandys published his *Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610*.<sup>5</sup> In it occurs the following:

Wine is prohibited them by their *Alcoran*. . . . Although they be destitute of Taverns, yet have they their Coffa-houses, which something resemble them. There sit they chatting most of the day; and sippe of a drinke called Coffa (of the berry that it is made of) in little *China* dishes, as hot as they can suffer it: blacke as soote, and tasting not much unlike it (why not that blacke broth which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians*?) which helpeth, as they say, digestion, and procureth alacrity: many of the coffa-men keeping beautifull boyes, who serve as stales to procure them customers. The *Turkes* are also incredible takers of *Opium* . . . which they say expelleth all feare, and makes them couragious.

Clearly this is the parent of both passages. In it are many details common to it and one of the two authors but lacking in the other. Bacon seemingly did not consider that the Lacedemonians were an essential addition to his scientific data. He saw no reason to represent the Turks as "chatting" over their coffee. Burton, on the other hand, implies that opium is taken to help digestion and procure alacrity; Bacon brings over the detail from Sandys more

<sup>3</sup> *Works* (Boston, 1860-1862), v, 26-27.

<sup>4</sup> (Chicago, 1888), pp. 966-967.

<sup>5</sup> (London, 1621), p. 66.

accurately when he says that opium "expelleth all fear." Other interesting differences may easily be detected by the reader.

It is always fascinating to speculate why certain changes should have been made. The minister in Burton excluded the passage about "beautifull boyes"; Bacon saw that it would not contribute to his scientific purpose. Bacon introduces details from other sources: "aromatical," "beaten into powder," betel and tobacco, "strong and aleger." Burton, on the other hand, follows Sandys with remarkable closeness. The latter's "There sit they chatting" becomes "there they sit chatting." And it almost looks as though he were trying to disarm the reader in the casual way in which he parenthesizes "like that blacke drinke which was in use amongst the *Lacedemonians* and perhaps the same." Sandys, to be sure, had been slightly more conservative in his statement; but he too had used the parenthesis. One wonders how many passages there are, all told, in Burton where quotation marks have been omitted.<sup>6</sup>

ROBERT R. CAWLEY

Princeton University

#### A BORROWING FROM SPENSER BY PHINEAS FLETCHER

The indebtedness of Phineas Fletcher's *Piscatorie Eclogues* to Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* is widely recognized. A number of similarities between the poems have been pointed out,<sup>1</sup> but an interesting borrowing, constituting a rather distinct type, has been overlooked.

The opening line of the third piscatory eclogue,

A Fisher-lad (no higher dares he look),

is certainly echoed from the beginning of Spenser's "January,"

A shepheards boye (no better doe him call),

and the whole opening section of Fletcher's poem is a translation into piscatory terms of the first lines of "January." Fletcher's fifth stanza reads:

<sup>6</sup> Shilleto, in his excellent edition of *The Anatomy*, failed to note that the Burton passage was derived from Sandys.

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Langdale (*Phineas Fletcher, Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity*, New York, 1937, Appendix B, pp. 217-218) presents an extensive list of Fletcher's borrowings from Spenser and others in the *Piscatorie Eclogues*.

You sea-born maids, that in the ocean reigne,  
 (If in your courts is known Loves matchlesse power,  
 Kindling his fire in your cold watry bower)  
 Learn by your own to pity others pain.  
*Tryphon*, that know'st a thousand herbs in vain,  
 But know'st not one to cure a love-sick heart,  
 See here a wound, that farre outgoes thy art.

The seventh and eighth stanzas each develop the idea suggested in their opening lines.

How well, fair *Thetis*, in thy glasse I see  
 As in a crystal, all my raging pains!  
 Such cruel storms my restles heart command:  
 Late thousand joyes securely lodged there.

This is exactly the same sequence of ideas and corresponding imagery which opens Spenser's "January." In the third stanza Spenser writes:

'Ye gods of love, that pitie lovers payne,  
 (If any gods the paine of lovers pitie,)  
 Looke from above, where you in joyes remaine,  
 And bowe your eares unto my dolefull dittie.  
 And Pan, thou shepheards god, that once didst love,  
 Pitie the paines that thou thy selfe didst prove.

The fourth and fifth stanzas begin:

'Thou barrein ground, whome winters wrath hath wasted,  
 Art made a myrrhour to behold my plight:  
 'Such rage as winters reigneth in my heart,  
 My lofe bloud friesing with unkindly cold.

In these passages very similar lines of address are followed by conditional parentheses and by respective appeals to Tryphon, a god of the sea, and to Pan, a god of forests and shepherds. Fletcher finds in the sea (the glass of Thetis) the mirror for sorrows which Spenser had seen in the barren winter land, and both recognize the external scene as symbolic of the unrest within. Here Fletcher appears to be consciously adapting the pastoral verse of Spenser to the seaside locale of his own poem.

BAIN TATE STEWART

*University of Tennessee*

THE BURNING OF MILTON'S *DEFENSIO* IN FRANCE

The inhospitable reception of Milton's *Defensio* in France has long been familiar to students,<sup>1</sup> but the facts have come to us hitherto chiefly from Milton's own references in his *Defensio Secunda*<sup>2</sup> and from contemporary newspapers.<sup>3</sup> It is now possible to supplement these sources by a detailed account taken directly from the official French records.<sup>4</sup> The following extracts tell the full story of the indignation experienced in monarchical France towards the impertinence of the democratically minded upstart pamphleteer who dared to recommend and condone the execution of a king.

In brief summary these documents indicate: (1) that the *Defensio* reached Toulouse for distribution shortly before June 16, 1651; (2) that the royal counsellors, MM. de Turreil and de Fresals, having examined the book, gave orders that it should be publicly burned in the Place du Salin; (3) that they also enjoined all booksellers and printers from touching the book, on grave penalties, and commanded them to return all copies already on hand within a week; (4) that this sentence was pronounced in the Parliament at Toulouse on June 16, 1651; (5) that information about the *Defensio* reached Paris some days previous to July 6, 1651; (6) that the royal government, having taken cognizance of its abhorrent character, ordered it publicly torn to pieces and burned in the Place de Grève; (7) that Parisian booksellers and printers, as in Toulouse, were forbidden to handle it; (8) that private citizens were prohibited from owning or possessing it; (9) that it was publicly burned in the Place de Grève on July 6, 1651; (10) that this order was publicly announced throughout the city and the University of Paris, with full paraphernalia of hue and cry, on July 11, 1651; (11) that these acts, despite Milton's protest to the contrary,<sup>5</sup> appear strictly official.

<sup>1</sup> David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, IV (1877), 341.

<sup>2</sup> Milton, *Defensio Secunda*, *Columbia Works*, VIII, 186-191.

<sup>3</sup> *Mercurius Politicus*, # 56 (June 26-July 3, 1651), p. 899; *ibid.*, # 58 (July 10-17), last page.

<sup>4</sup> Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. F. L. 602, ff. 21-23. See also A. Vidier and P. Perrier, *Bibliothèque Nationale, Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Français*, IV (Paris, 1937), 379.

<sup>5</sup> Milton, *Defensio Secunda*, *Works*, VIII, 186-187.

The first extract is the order at Toulouse: <sup>6</sup>

Extrait des Registres de Parlem<sup>t</sup>.

Sur la requeste verbalement faite par le Procureur Grāl <sup>7</sup> du Roy, contenant que depuis quelques iours il se debite vn liure en la presente ville intitulé *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio contra Salmasij defensionem Regiam*, imprimé a Londres la presente annee, contenant des Maximes impies et seditieuses, tendant a la destruction, rabaissem<sup>t</sup> et aneantisssem<sup>t</sup> entier des monarchies establies de Dieu en terre pour la conduite des hommes. Et dautant que ce liure est iniurieux a l'autorité Royale, que l'auteur du liure tasche de rendre contemptible & mesprisable aux peuples, et quil seroit d'une tres pernicieuse consequence de souffrir la debite et lecture du dit liure dans vn Royaume comme la France, gouvernee successivement puis tans de siecles par les Rois qu'il a pleu a Dieu lui donner; A requis qu'il pleut a la Cour y pourvoir par la prudence ordinaire; Et veu le dit liure, et ouïs <sup>8</sup> Maistres de Tourreil & de Fresals Cons<sup>s</sup> <sup>9</sup> du Roy en la Cour & Commissaires à ce par [Nous?] <sup>10</sup> deputez, La Cour, ayant esgard a la diste requeste, A ordonné & ordonne que le dit liure Intitulé *Ioannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano defensio*, imprimé a Londres la presente Annee, sera brusle a la place du Salin par l'executeur de la haute iustice, au quel effet auroit enioint aux officiers de la Seneschaussee, Viguier et Capitouls <sup>11</sup> d'assister a l'exécution du present Arrest, en la forme accoustumée. A fait & fait inhibitions et defenses a tous marchans libraires, imprimeurs & autres personnes de quelque qualité qu'elles soient, de vendre, debiter ni tenir chez eux le dit liure, a peine de quatre mil liures d'amende & autre arbitre: Leur enioignant sur mesme peine de remettre dans huictaine apres la publication du present Arrest tous les exemplaires qu'ils en peuvent auoir deuers le Greffe <sup>12</sup> de la Cour. Prononcé a Tolose en Parlem<sup>t</sup> le dix-septiesme Juin 1651. Signé De Malenfant.

The second order comes from Paris, about three weeks after the preceding: <sup>13</sup>

1651 De par le Roy, ou Mons<sup>r</sup> le Preuost de Paris,  
ou son Lieutenant ciuil.

Sur ce qui nous a esté remonstré par le Procureur du Roy, que depuis peu

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, ff. 21-22.

<sup>7</sup> *I. e.*, "général."

<sup>8</sup> An absolute construction: "the book having been seen and [the commissioners] having been heard."

<sup>9</sup> *I. e.*, "conseillers."

<sup>10</sup> Since this word comes at the edge of the page and hence is not clear in the photostat, this reading is tentative.

<sup>11</sup> Technical titles of certain officers of justice.

<sup>12</sup> The registry.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, f. 23.



de iours on a publié un Liure intitulé, *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano defensio contra Claudij [Salmasij erased] anonymi, aliàs Salmasij defensionem regiam*: lequel est rempli de diuerses propositions contraires a la doctrine de l'Eglise, a l'obeissance deüe aux souuerains, qui ne peuuent y auoir esté mises qu'a dessein d'exciter les peuples a sedition: A quoi il requiert estre pourueu. Nous oui la dite Remonstrance, & apres que le liure a esté leu & examiné a la chambre du Conseil, Ordonnons par deliberation d'icelui,<sup>14</sup> que le dit Liure intitulé: *Ioannis Miltoni Angli pro populo*, &c. comme contenant vne doctrine impie, contraire aux loix diuines et humaines, seditieuse, tendante a la destruction des estats, à attenter à la personne des Roys & Princes souuerains, & a détourner les subiets de leur obeissance, sera laceré & bruslé par les mains de l'executeur de haute Justice en place de Greue: Et qu'a la requeste du Procureur du Roy il sera informé contre les Autheurs & Imprimeurs du dit liure, & procedé contre eux extraordinairement suiuant la rigueur des Ordonances. Faisons defenses a toutes personnes de le uendre, debiter, & faire courir dans le public, mesmes de le retenir dans leurs maisons, à peine d'estre reputez fauteurs de telles propositions, & d'estre procedé contre eux comme criminels de leze Maiesté diuine & humaine. Et seront ces presentes leües & publiées à son de trompe & cry public, & affichées aux carrefours de cette ville de Paris. Ce fut fait & donné par Messire Dreux Daubray Seigneur d'Offemont, Villiers & autres lieux, Conseiller du Roy en ses conseils, & Lieutenant Ciuil en la preuosté & Vicomté de Paris, le sixième Juillet 1651. Prononcé & executé, et le dit liure bruslé en la dite place de Greue le dit iour. Signé, Coudray.

The third, dated five days later, follows directly on the second:<sup>15</sup>

Le Mardi 11. Juillet 1651. la Sentence cy-dessus a esté leüe & publiée a son de trompe & cry public, par les carrefours ordinaires de cette Ville, & dans l'Vniuersité de Paris par moy Charles Canto Juré crieur ordinaire du Roy en la dite Ville preuosté et Vicomté de Paris, accompagné de Jean du Bos, Jacques le Frain Iurez Trompettes du Roy es<sup>16</sup> dits lieux, & d'un autre trompette commis.

Signé Canto.

J. MILTON FRENCH

Rutgers University

<sup>14</sup> *I. c.*, "the same."

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, f. 23.

<sup>16</sup> *I. c.*, "en les."

## MILTON'S CALLIMACHUS

Professor Harris Fletcher has recently identified certain editions of Homer to which John Milton had access, and which he studied before 1630.<sup>1</sup> The evidence used is both simple and conclusive, consisting of an analysis of the *marginalia* in Milton's own handwriting in the 1620 edition of Pindar in the Harvard University Library. The citations of Homer and Eustathius in the *marginalia* give page references, and as a result Professor Fletcher was able to prove his conclusions beyond all doubt. Unfortunately Milton did not use page references to all the editions of classical authors he cited, so that exact identifications of the other books in his private library are rendered more difficult, and in some cases impossible.

For Callimachus, however, the problem is perhaps even simpler than for Homer. In the *marginalia* of the Pindar, Milton quotes from or refers to the hymns, epigrams, and fragments of Callimachus twenty-seven times.<sup>2</sup> Most of these passages are simply pertinent verse references or quotations from Callimachus, but five times Milton adds, as further evidence, references to the annotations of Bonaventura Vulcanius on Callimachus, either in support of the quoted line, or for an interpretation of the Pindaric text and commentary. In none of the passages is the page number added, but that is not necessary in order to establish the identity of the young Milton's edition of Callimachus. There seems to have been only one edition of Callimachus by Vulcanius, that, namely, which appeared in 1584 at Antwerp,<sup>3</sup> and which contained a text, a Latin translation, and a commentary. Bound with it, separately edited also by Vulcanius, are the *Idylls* of Moschus and Bion. Milton quotes from Moschus only four times in the Pindar *marginalia*, and does not mention Bion at all. The four quotations, however, may reasonably be regarded as deriving from this same edition, because Milton had a way of being thorough in his use of a book, and we have no evidence that he used any other edition of Moschus.

One of Milton's annotations is also of interest; it throws light on

<sup>1</sup> H. Fletcher, "Milton's Homer," *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 229-32.

<sup>2</sup> Unhappily not all of them are in the Columbia edition's 'transcripts' of the *marginalia*, because the editors of that work restricted themselves to a selection which included only notes that display originality by Milton.

<sup>3</sup> A copy of this edition has been available for examination at the Library of the University of Illinois.

his methods of study. On page 230 of the Pindar, he proposes a change in the text. The passage is *Olympian Odes* 13, 81, in which the editor accepts the manuscript reading ἀνερύη, whereas in the margin Milton has written ἀνερύην. This latter reading is not mentioned in the commentary, and in quoting from the *Iliad* the editor uses the form ἀνέρυσαν. This is the only substantial textual change in Pindar which Milton made without selecting a reading from the commentary. Consequently Milton offers his own reasons for the change in the following marginal note on page 231:

Vide Bonaventura Vulc: in Callim: hymn; in Diana, versus 91, qui legit ἀνερύειν vel αὐ ἐρύειν non ἀνερύειν.

Bon: Vul. legit hic Αὐ ἐρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα, καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν. *Iliad*: α.

Examination of Vulcanius' commentary<sup>4</sup> shows that Milton is appealing to a scholarly three-page note in support of the proposed change. The line from the *Iliad*<sup>5</sup> is used by Vulcanius as noted by Milton, and in addition the editor of Callimachus quotes the Pindar passage as well, with the form ἀνερύη.<sup>6</sup> Milton then is not actually making an emendation, but is rather drawing on the resources of his memory and wide studies. In other words, here is a concrete example of the student Milton at work. In the present instance his chief tool is our edition of Callimachus. Just as for Homer Milton had access to what Dr. Fletcher calls the "most elaborate and comprehensive scholarly works" of his age, so for Callimachus he found available an edition of considerable scholarly worth, the identification of which may prove to have something more than mere bibliographical interest.

NATHAN DANE II

University of Illinois

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 204-6.

<sup>5</sup> A 459. It is interesting to note that Vulcanius quotes the same line from Homer in col. 798 of his *Thesaurus Utriusque Linguae*, published at Leyden in 1600, a copy of which is also available at the Library of the University of Illinois.

<sup>6</sup> This passage in Pindar has caused the editors considerable trouble for reasons of metre and dialect. In general, however, most recent editors, except Farnell, have accepted ἀνερύη. This is apparently what Milton intended by ἀνερύην, since he is quoting Vulcanius, who reads ἀνερύη, which is attested by one scholiast, but not by the manuscripts.

A NOTE ON BLAIR'S EDITION OF *THE UNHAPPY FAVOURITE*

In the Introduction to his facsimile reprint of Banks's *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682 Quarto), Mr. T. M. H. Blair discusses the source of the play.<sup>1</sup> He accepts Langbaine's statement that the play was "founded on a novel called, *The Secret History of the Most Renowned Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex*, printed in 12°. Lond. 1680."<sup>2</sup> In the last scene of Part I of this intimate novel, of which there are two parts, Rutland, not knowing that the Queen plans to pardon Essex, visits Elizabeth to plead for the life of the man who is secretly married to Rutland and who has been imprisoned for treason against the Queen. Mr. Blair describes Rutland's explanation of Essex's actions as follows:

Their private marriage, she confesses, "contrary to the Respect due to your Majesty," led him to fear the Queen's just indignation and gave him the idea of seeking "*Revenge*" [*sic*] outside her dominions, but he never harbored a thought of conspiring against her rule.<sup>3</sup>

The passage in the *Secret History* thus described reads:

I acknowledge, Madam, that after a thousand Crosses, we had that tender Kindness one for the other, that we married privately, contrary to the Respect due to your Majesty. This, Madam this only, and his Fear of your Majesty's just Indignation, put the Earl of Essex upon seeking *Revenge* out of your Dominions; He thought it fit I should go out of them, but never harboured a Thought of conspiring against your Majesty.<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Blair is quite naturally troubled by the lack of artistic and psychological nicety in the choice of the word "Revenge," and offers the following justification for its use:

Rutland is not careful in her choice of the most tactful word in the circumstances; presumably she means a purely personal kind of *revenge* which takes the form of living his private life as he desires to live it,

<sup>1</sup> T. M. H. Blair, ed., *The Unhappy Favourite or the Earl of Essex*, by John Banks (New York, 1939), pp. 36-49.

<sup>2</sup> Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets*, etc. (Oxford, 1691), p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Blair, *op. cit.*, p. 42. The italics throughout this paper are mine.

<sup>4</sup> P. 50, lines 12-23. There is a copy of this book in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C.

regardless of the Queen's probable indignation. She does not mean political *revenge* taking the form of treason.<sup>5</sup>

Considering that Essex had pretended a great affection for Elizabeth while secretly married to Rutland, that he had plotted with Tyrone while in command of the English forces in Ireland, and that he was at this time wholly in Elizabeth's power, there can be no doubt that Rutland's use of the word "Revenge" requires explanation. There is, however, a more adequate explanation than that offered by Mr. Blair.

A chapbook in the Harvard Library bears the following title page:

The / History / of the Most Renowned / Queen Elizabeth, / and Her Great Favourite, / The Earl of Essex. / In Two Parts. / A Romance. / [A woodcut of Essex / A woodcut of Elizabeth] / London: Printed by W. O. and Sold by the Booksellers.<sup>6</sup>

Long ago John Ashton saw that this chapbook was based upon the *Secret History*.<sup>7</sup> In fact, the chapbook is composed almost wholly of excerpts of those passages in the *Secret History* necessary to the narrative. There are, consequently, many passages in the chapbook which are similar word for word to passages in the *Secret History*. The passage in the chapbook corresponding to the passage from the *Secret History* quoted earlier reads:

I own, Madam, that after a thousand Crosses, we had that tender Kindness for each other, that we married privately, contrary to that Respect due from us to your Majesty: This, Madam, and this only, with his fear of your just indignation, put the Earl of Essex upon seeking *Refuge* out of your Domions [*sic*]: He thought it fit I shoul'd go out of them, but never entertain'd a thought of Conspiring against your Majesty.<sup>8</sup>

We immediately observe that "Refuge" has taken the place of

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 42, n. 5.

<sup>6</sup> See W. C. Lane, ed., *Catalogue of English Chap-books and Broadside Ballads in Harvard College Library* (Library of Harvard University Bibliographical Publications, no. 56; Cambridge, 1905), no. 224. See also nos. 225 and 226.

<sup>7</sup> John Ashton, *Chapbooks of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1882), p. 396.

<sup>8</sup> P. 18, lines 32-37. This quotation occurs at the beginning of Part II, instead of at the end of Part I, as in the Folger *Secret History*. Perhaps the edition from which this chapbook was made differed from the edition now to be found in the Folger Library in this respect.

"Revenge," and that Rutland's statement offers no difficulty when this substitution is made.

The word "Revenge" in the passage from the copy of the *Secret History* which Mr. Blair examined seems best explained as a misprint for "Refuge." That there were other editions of this very popular book is evidenced by the *Term Catalogues*, I (1668-1709).<sup>9</sup> Also, Sir Sidney Lee mentions the edition of 1650.<sup>10</sup> One is led to conclude, therefore, that the passage in the chapbook indicates the correct reading found in other editions of the *Secret History*, from some one of which the chapbook was probably set up.

University of North Carolina

R. M. LUMIANSKY

---

#### THE "CLOSET" AND THE "STAGE" IN 1759

In *A History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama 1750-1800* Mr. Allardyce Nicoll has remarked that in the closing years of the eighteenth century "it became more or less universally understood that certain types of drama were fundamentally unactable, and 'closet' and 'theatre' appreciation were made the starting point from which a play was to be viewed." The distinguished historian of the English drama adds, moreover, that "there seems not the slightest doubt that the main cause contributing to this development was the unprecedented activity in the realm of translation—particularly of translation from the German—which extended from 1790 onwards."<sup>1</sup> Without attempting to minimize the influence of translations from the German, I should like to call attention to

<sup>9</sup> Arber's ed., pp. 417, 433, 466.

<sup>10</sup> *DNB.*, s. v. "Robert Devereaux, Second Earl of Essex." It may be that Lee means the chapbook and not the *Secret History* as Blair states (*op. cit.*, p. 37, note). Lee's title corresponds more nearly to that of the chapbook. Banks's failure to make use of Rutland's biographical account (see Blair, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-47), material admirably suited for him in its pathetic appeal, might be explained by his reference to a chapbook similar to the one described in this note, which omits Rutland's long history of her troubles, rather than to the *Secret History*. The whole matter of the relationship between this chapbook and the Elizabethan-Essex literature needs more study. I hope to shed some light on it in the near future.

<sup>1</sup> P. 218. Cf. pp. 72-73.



two discussions of the drama in relation to the "closet" as opposed to the "stage," both of which appeared, by coincidence, in 1759.

The following criticism of Addison and his famous *Cato* (1713) occurs in Edward Young's epochal *Conjectures on Original Composition*.

There is this similitude between the poet and the play; as this is more fit for the closet than the stage, so, that shone brighter in private conversation than on the public scene. . . . This puts me in mind of *Plato*, who denied *Homer* to the public; that *Homer*, which, when in his closet, was rarely out of his hand. Thus, tho' *Cato* is not calculated to signalize himself in the warm emotions of the theatre, yet we find him a most amiable companion, in our calmer delights of recess.<sup>2</sup>

Addison's play, Young felt, lacked the "warm emotions of the theatre," the appeal to the sentiments of the audience. It had "much more of art, than nature in it." For this herald of Romanticism, *Cato* was too cold a tragedy for the stage; indeed, it was "an exquisite piece of statuary" rather than a play. *Cato* was too "artful," too sculptural. Already one hears the accents of such a Romantic critic as Hazlitt, for whom Addison's work was also "a marble slab," an ancient bas-relief—a drama only by courtesy.

Young all but explicitly differentiated between the "poetic" and the "stage" play:

he who sees not much beauty in [*Cato*], has no taste for poetry; he who sees nothing else, has no taste for the stage.<sup>3</sup>

None the less, the critic genuinely admired the poetry and the sculptural qualities of *Cato*: "as it is, like Pygmalion, we cannot but fall in love with it, and wish it were alive." Young still regarded the "stage" as the sphere of the dramatist, though he felt that certain plays were suited to the "closet" rather than to the "stage."

In the same year as the *Conjectures* Oliver Goldsmith discussed the "closet" drama in a quite different manner and with more far-reaching implications. In the interests of virtue and morality he recommended plays for one's "closet" in *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning*. In fact, he took the extreme position that plays are better read than seen, even stating that the

<sup>2</sup> *Edward Young's Conjectures on Original Composition*, ed. Edith Morley (Manchester, 1918), p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

"theatre" exists as a means for getting plays into the hands of readers!

The success . . . of pieces upon the stage would be of little moment, did it not influence the success of the same piece in the closet. Nay, I think it would be more for the interests of virtue, if stage performances were read, not acted; made rather for companions in the cabinet [1st ed., closet] than on the theatre. . . . But, whatever be the incentives to vice which are found at the theatre, public pleasures are generally less guilty than solitary ones. To make our solitary satisfaction truly innocent, the actor is useful, as by this means the poet's work makes its way from the stage to the closet; for all must allow, that the reader receives more benefit by perusing a well written play, than by seeing it acted.<sup>4</sup>

The statements come unexpectedly from the man who some fifteen years later wrote such a "low" comedy as *She Stoops to Conquer*, which was aimed at making an audience merry. But in the *Enquiry* at least Goldsmith advanced the opinion that the "stage" was secondary to the success of a play in the "closet." When one thinks thus of the reader as the ultimate goal of the dramatist, the "poetic" play is definitely encouraged. The way is opened for Lamb's view of things too abstract, too "deep," too "poetic," for the "stage" and also for Byron's "mental theatre."

The remarks of Young and Goldsmith strongly suggest that the elements in the pre-Romantic taste of the middle of the eighteenth century which they reflect, namely, the dissatisfaction with a "cold," static, and "unnatural" drama and the didactic impulse, should be mentioned among the contributors to the distinction between plays of the "closet" and of the "stage," which became so apparent late in the eighteenth century.

STEPHEN A. LARRABEE

Waterville, Maine

---

#### A DUBLIN MILTON ENTHUSIAST

In his recent article in *MLN*, "Three Imitations of Spenser,"<sup>1</sup> J. N. Hook so marshals his material that the reader unfamiliar with the work of Samuel Whyte (1733-1811), the author of the "Imitations" Mr. Hook discusses, would number Whyte among

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, ed. Peter Cunningham (New York and London, 1900), III, 66.

<sup>1</sup> June, 1940, pp. 431-2.

the followers of Spenser. But examination of Whyte's work shows him chiefly a follower of Milton. The following evidence bears this statement out.

His borrowings from Milton for the verse of *The Shamrock: or Hibernian Cresses* (Dublin, 1772) are many and evident, although he acknowledges but four.<sup>2</sup> A few of the numerous unacknowledged ones are: "Sullen Roar" (p. 13; cf. "Penseroso," 76); "Thus Eden springs where late you found a Waste" (p. 14; cf. *P. R.*, 1, 7); "With many a Ringlet print the Grass" (p. 97; cf. "Allegro," 84-5); "There Wisdom, resting on her Gorgon Shield" (p. 218; cf. *Comus*, 447-8); "Save that the Nightingale, from yonder Spray" (p. 234; cf. Sonnet 1, 1); "And sweet, with thee, was Evening's Gentle Close" (p. 270; cf. *P. L.*, iv, 646-7). The description of the great temple in "Peruvian Letters," vii, pp. 406-7, is from Satan's temple in hell, *P. L.*, i, 710-30. It should be noted, however, that Whyte did not ape his idol in writing blank verse; he wrote only in rime. Subjoined to *The Shamrock* is an essay by Whyte on education, and in that part dealing with the instruction of young ladies he says that "the reading of Milton alone . . . might open to them almost the whole circle of human science."<sup>3</sup> And he who teaches Milton must know the scriptures, the sciences, rhetoric, geography, history, heraldry, painting, etc., etc.<sup>4</sup>

In *A Collection of Poems* (Dublin, 1792-4),<sup>5</sup> he records a performance of *Comus* at Marlay, the seat of David Latouche, on 30th September, 1776.<sup>6</sup> In view of what Professor Havens has to say of the "Late Vogue of The Shorter Poems,"<sup>7</sup> the sentiment of Whyte's prologue that "*Comus* . . . neglected lay, 'Till genuine taste . . . found its worth,"<sup>8</sup> is of interest. The *Collection* also includes six sonnets, five of which have hitherto been overlooked. The sixth, a Spenserian, reprinted from *The Shamrock*, is noted by Mr. Hook. The other five sonnets are basically Petrarchan or

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 41, 189, 270.

<sup>3</sup> P. 501.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The list of subscribers includes "George Washington, President of Congress, America."

<sup>6</sup> P. 61. The playbill, p. 60, lists Henry Gratton as a performer.

<sup>7</sup> *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, Cambridge, 1922, pp. 419-38.

<sup>8</sup> P. 61.

Shakespearean in form, and sonnet III has an arrangement of the tercets that Milton uses several times. This fact; some Miltonic borrowings such as "to wallow in a sensual sty" (cf. *Comus*, 77); and vocative openings in four sonnets would suggest that Whyte wrote them under Milton's influence.

RUSSELL K. ALSPACH

University of Pennsylvania

### "GILL MORICE" IN THE *RELIQUES* AGAIN

In a commendable article entitled "Percy's Reliques" Mr. L. F. Powell is greatly in error in his account of the text of "Gill Morice" as found in Percy's production. He states:

By the summer of 1758 he had started on the fatal course of giving to the world his 'Current impressions,' for in a mutilated letter . . . Percy tells Shenstone that he 'can think of no rhyme for Sun, in the 14th stanza of the Additions to Gill Morice,' adding 'but what if you find one for perfume. Query? "threads of Gold drawn from Minerva's loom" or something infinitely better.' This line, with the Scotticization of 'from' to 'frae,' is one of the sixteen additional lines impertinently intercalated into the Scottish ballad, which Percy describes (*Reliques*, iii. 93) as having been produced and handed about in manuscript, forgetting to tell us that production was his own.<sup>1</sup>

But the additions were not written by Percy. In his first letter to Shenstone (November 24, 1757) Percy asks in a postscript for the text of "the old Scotch Song intituled Gil Morris" (which he had heard Shenstone read aloud), so that he might compare it with the version called Child Maurice in his Folio MS. Shenstone's reply (January 4, 1758) was accompanied by the requested ballad and also, as the printed correspondence shows, by a separate sheet (folio 9) headed, "Gill Morice / In place of y<sup>e</sup> 14<sup>th</sup> stanza read y<sup>e</sup> three following:—" and giving three eight-line stanzas numbered 14, 15, and 16.<sup>2</sup> Of these the last four lines of stanza 14, all of

<sup>1</sup> *The Library*, 4th Ser. ix, 115-16.

<sup>2</sup> Hans Hecht, "Percy und Shenstone," *Quellen und Forschungen*, ciii, 7-8. It must be remembered that Mr. Powell was using the manuscript letters themselves, not Hecht's transcription, and that folio 9 may have been misplaced or removed before he consulted them, and that he did not notice the gap in numbering.

stanza 15, and the last four lines of stanza 16 form with one exception the sixteen lines "impertinently intercalated" <sup>3</sup> into the ballad as it appears in the *Reliques*. The last four lines of stanza 14 read:

His hair was like the threads of gold  
Shot frae y<sup>e</sup> burning Sun,  
His lips like roses drapping dew,  
His breath was a perfume.

Above the last of these four lines was written as a variant, "When as his race (y<sup>e</sup> Sun's) was run," affording Percy an example for free handling of the added lines, and between this stanza and the next, "I wish you w<sup>d</sup> mend this Rhyme. 't is Pity." Thus Percy's emendation, "drawn from Minerva's loom," as suggested in his later letter to Shenstone <sup>4</sup> and adopted in the *Reliques*, was merely what he had been asked to do, except that he replaced line 6 instead of line 8 of the stanza.

Percy did not think that the additions were written by Shenstone. Shenstone's comment on the false rhyme "'t is Pity" does not sound like a request for assistance on his own lines. And that is not all. The last two lines of stanza 16 read:

He sang sae sweet it might dispell  
A' rage but fell dispair.

To the last line Shenstone appended the comment: "This, considering Addison's Note upon Milton's 'able to chase All sadness but despair,' [P. L. IV, 155-56] looks a little more modern y<sup>n</sup> y<sup>e</sup> rest, but may not be so." <sup>5</sup> To this Percy replied (immediately after the lines quoted by Mr. Powell concerning the *loom* emendation):

<sup>3</sup> With the *impertinence* of the additions anyone of the twentieth century would agree. The lines harmonize with the ballad as little as would Mrs. Malaprop in *Electra*, or chocolate sauce on roast beef.

<sup>4</sup> Letter V, now fragmentary and undated, Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> In a footnote to the passage in the *Reliques* Percy expands and corrects the quotation: "So Milton,

Vernal delight and joy: able to drive  
All sadness but despair."

The amazing thing is that Shenstone could believe, or even pretend to believe, that the additions were anything but modern. But the time-sense was slow in developing.

I can hardly help suspecting the last Line of Stanza 16th to be borrow'd from the Passage you refer to in Milton, among other for this reason: the Expression in Milton has a propriety, which it has not in the Sonnet [i. e., song]: Satan was litterally prey'd upon by despair, but the baron's passions, tho' of the black kind, could hardly have grown to that height so suddenly, as to settle into despair.<sup>6</sup>

These are not words Percy, uncertain about his own taste, would write concerning a production, however minor, of Shenstone, confident of the infallibility of his. Percy's statement in his introduction to "Gill Morrice" in the *Reliques* is quite accurate: ". . . sixteen additional verses have been produced and handed about in manuscript, . . . (but are perhaps, after all, only an ingenious interpolation)."

The old notion about the unreliability of Percy's published statements dies hard.

LEAH DENNIS

Alabama College

---

#### MOSES BROWNE AND THE 1783 EDITION OF GILES AND PHINEAS FLETCHER

In the preface to his *Piscatory Eclogues* (1729), Moses Browne wrote an enthusiastically appreciative account of Phineas Fletcher's poetry and discussed the seventeenth-century poet with a knowledge that was rather unusual in that period, when most of the minor writers of the past were neglected and forgotten. Even at this early date he implied an intention to recall Phineas Fletcher to public notice: "Methinks I should be glad if I could revive any just esteem for this great, unhappy Man,<sup>1</sup> whose Writings are almost lost to us, and which I would give the Reader a Taste of."<sup>2</sup> Such a taste he proceeded, in this same preface, to give the reader. He did not, however, quote his original verbatim but "improved" the text in accordance with his own sense of poetic fitness. For example, he altered "chaunt" to "sing"; "silver Medway's flood" to "Medway's silver flood"; "noon-tides rage" to "noon-tides heat";

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

<sup>1</sup> Browne was under the impression that Phineas Fletcher was the subject of Milton's *Lycidas*.

<sup>2</sup> [Browne, Moses], *Piscatory Eclogues* (London, 1729), 25.



"troublous world" to "vexatious world"; and "His bed of wool yields safe and quiet sleep" to "His bed more safe than soft yields quiet sleep." Moreover, Browne again engaged in precisely this same kind of textual redaction in his edition of Walton's *Compleat Angler* (1750).<sup>3</sup> The similarity between this treatment of an author's text and the editorial method employed in the anonymous 1783 edition of Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victory and Triumph* and Phineas Fletcher's *Purple Island*,<sup>4</sup> and the fact that Browne was well acquainted with the Fletchers' works, suggest the possibility that he was the anonymous editor.

In addition, the pious tone of the preface and of the textual alterations, and the religious nature of the poems selected strongly suggest that the editor of the 1783 Fletchers was a churchman. And whoever the editor was, he was probably an intimate friend of the Reverend James Hervey, for in his preface to Phineas Fletcher's poem the editor confessed his indebtedness to Hervey: "In the *Letters* written [by Hervey] to his Friends, we find mention made of this very Poem; which was put into his Hands a few Weeks before his Decease: with which he was so well pleased, that he intended revising it for the Press; and to add another Poem entitled *Christ's Victory and Triumph in Heaven and on Earth*."<sup>5</sup> Even

<sup>3</sup> "Mr. Walton was a Writer of the true pastoral Character, in which perhaps he has not his Parallel; yet, through a willing Inattention, and different Mode of Language then in use, some frequent Inaccuracies and Redundencies have insinuated themselves, which I should be injurious to him as his Editor, not to retouch and prune away. . . . My Aim was, but to file off that Rust, which Time fixes on the most curious and finished Things, and to imitate in this the Pains an elaborate Workman would bestow in repairing some Pile of exquisite antient Architecture: or the Art a judicious Painter would be supposed to use, in refitting up a decayed and curious Portrait of some great Master." Walton's *Complete Angler*, ed. Moses Browne (London, 1759), xiii.

<sup>4</sup> See my "Elizabethan Poetry 'Improved,'" *MP*, xxxvii (1940), 357-69, which is, in part, an analysis of the textually unwarranted alterations in this edition.

<sup>5</sup> Hervey's entire letter, incidentally, is an interesting clarification of the kind of eighteenth-century editorial policy employed in the 1783 Fletchers (see my article, *supra*). After urging his anonymous correspondent to reprint *Christ's Victory* and *The Purple Island*, "properly revised and altered," he writes: "Had I been in perfect health, and disengaged from other employment, I question whether I should not have retouched the poetry, changed several of the obsolete words, illustrated the obscure

in an effort to apologize for the obsolete language of the poems, the editor called upon a remark that Hervey had made "on a similar Occasion." It was through the encouragement of Hervey that Moses Browne took orders in the English church; and in 1753 he became Hervey's curate.

It seems probable, then, that Browne transmitted to Hervey his own earlier interest in the Fletchers and was encouraged in turn to edit their poems,<sup>6</sup> but delayed until he was prompted to carry out the project by the appearance in 1771 of Lord Woodhouselee's edition of Phineas Fletcher's *Piscatory Eclogues*. The only detail that seems to oppose this ascription is the fact that the dedicatory poem, which, according to the title page, is by the editor, is signed "P. B."

EARL R. WASSERMAN

University of Illinois

---

#### ON THE SERIAL PUBLICATION OF *OLIVER TWIST*

In his Introduction to *Oliver Twist*, published in 1897, Charles Dickens the Younger states that his father's story began in *Bentley's Miscellany* in February, 1837. Speaking of an interruption in the serialization of the story that occurred in June of that year, he says: "No instalment of the story was published in this month, but it was resumed in July, and continued without interruption until the appearance in the magazine of its concluding chapter in March, 1839."<sup>1</sup> The editor of *Oliver Twist* in the National Library

passages by occasional notes. . . . Could not Rivington get some one to make these necessary alterations? Or, if he does not care to engage in it, would not Dodsley undertake it, who is himself a poet, and very capable of abridging it in some places, enlarging it in others, and thoroughly correcting the whole? . . . Methinks if a subscription to modernize valuable authors, and thus rescue them from the pit of oblivion, was properly set on foot . . . it would meet with due encouragement" (*The Whole Works of the Late Rev. James Hervey*, London, 1819, vi, 392). This is the most forthright contemporary statement I have been able to find of this type of eighteenth-century editing.

<sup>6</sup> Hervey had once before commissioned Browne to engage in poetical work, a translation of Zimmermann's *De Eminentia Cogitationes Christi*. See Hervey, *op. cit.*, 374.

<sup>1</sup> *The Adventures of Oliver Twist*, London, 1924 [first copyright, 1897], p. xiv.

Edition of Dickens's *Works* follows Charles Dickens the Younger in part when he says, "it [*Oliver Twist*] ran as a serial in the pages of 'Bentley's Miscellany' from January [*sic.* February] 1837 to March 1839."<sup>2</sup> On the same points Mr. John C. Eckel says: "Publication of the [Bentley's] *Miscellany* began in January, 1837, and in the second number was begun the printing of *Oliver Twist*. This continued monthly until March, 1839, with the elapse of one month occasioned by the death of Mary Hogarth."<sup>3</sup> This statement is followed by Messrs. Hatton and Cleaver when they assert that *Oliver Twist* was published "firstly, as a serial in *Bentley's Miscellany* from February, 1837 (except June, 1837) to March, 1839."<sup>4</sup>

From the preceding, we note these points of agreement: (1) three of the above mentioned authorities agree that the first installment of *Oliver Twist* appeared in the February 1837 Number of *Bentley's Miscellany*; (2) three of them agree that it suffered one interruption—its non-appearance in June, 1837; and (3) all agree that it ended in the March 1839 Number.

Since practically all copies of *Bentley's Miscellany* for the period of Dickens's editorship and shortly thereafter have been stripped of their covers and date lines and have been bound into half-year volumes, the exact extent of each monthly number is difficult to determine. Fortunately the principal stories were accompanied by illustrations that are dated consistently from January 1, 1837, to November 1, 1838, inclusive. From that time onward, the plates illustrating *Oliver Twist* bear only the date of the year; yet the portion for December, 1838, can be dated easily and accurately by its position in the physical format. Beginning with January 1, 1839, William Harrison Ainsworth's *Jack Shepherd* becomes the leading story in the *Miscellany*, stands at the beginning of each monthly number, and is accompanied by a plate bearing the day, month, and year of publication. So it furnishes an accurate means for dating correctly and determining the exact extent of each monthly number.

<sup>2</sup> New York, [1928], 20 vols., III, [x].

<sup>3</sup> *The First Editions of the Writings of Charles Dickens*, Revised and Enlarged, New York, 1932, p. 59.

<sup>4</sup> *A Bibliography of the Periodical Works of Charles Dickens*, London, 1933, p. 215.

The authorities mentioned above speak of only one interruption in the serial publication of *Oliver Twist*—that for the month of June, 1837; whereas, there were three interruptions. The first came as a consequence of the death of Mary Hogarth, the young sister-in-law of Dickens, who lived in his home. In place of the customary installment for number VI, June, 1837, there appeared the announcement:

Since the appearance of the last number of this work the editor has to mourn the sudden death of a very dear young relative to whom he was most affectionately attached. . . . He has been compelled to seek a short interval of rest and quiet. The next number will be conducted by him, as usual, and the adventures of *Oliver Twist* will be continued.

In still another place there was the statement:

*Oliver Twist*: We beg to announce that the "Adventures of the Parrish Boy" under the above title, will be continued in our next *Miscellany*. The melancholy domestic afflictions which Mr. Dickens has just sustained prevented the possibility of any mental exertion for the present number.<sup>5</sup>

The second interruption in the serial publication of *Oliver Twist*—unmentioned by any of the four authorities quoted above—occurred when the October 1837 Number carried this announcement: "*Oliver Twist* will be continued by Mr. Dickens in the next number of the *Miscellany*, and after that from month to month as usual. The great length of the proceedings of the Mudfog Association prevented the insertion of the usual continuation this month."<sup>6</sup> Although Mr. Ley called attention to this second interruption in 1928, it was not noticed by Mr. Eckel or Messrs. Hatton and Cleaver, publishing respectively in 1932 and 1933. This second interruption is more difficult to understand than the first. The only possible explanation is that the work of writing *Pickwick*, editing *The Memoirs of Grimaldi*, supplying an original article each month for the *Miscellany*, and editing the last named work proved too great a task for Dickens, with the result that the printer's dead-line caught him short of material for *Oliver Twist*.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has previously called attention to the third interruption, the omission of this story from the September, 1838, number. The general contents of

<sup>5</sup> J. W. T. Ley, ed., *The Life of Charles Dickens by John Forster*, London, 1928, p. 99, n. 101.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

Volume IV for the last half of 1838 lists *Oliver Twist* as appearing on pages 1, 105, 209, 313, 417, and 521. But a reference to the text shows that *Oliver Twist* did not appear on page 209—or anywhere else in the September issue. In the place of the usual installment, stands Dickens's "Full Report of the Second Meeting of the Mudfog Association for the Advancement of Everything" and continues to page 227. Standing at the head of this paper is an illustration by Cruikshank dated September 1, 1838.

There is no ready explanation of this third interruption in the serial publication of *Oliver Twist*. It is interesting that in each of the last two interruptions the Mudfog Association papers should fill up the space ordinarily occupied by *Oliver*. We may surmise that the printer's dead-line caught Dickens a second time. But why? Just at this time Dickens was having serious trouble with Bentley over his contracts. He had agreed to edit the *Miscellany*, write *Oliver Twist* as a serial for that journal, furnish an original article for each monthly number of the journal, and write a new story—*Barnaby Rudge*—for Bentley. Without going into the question of the justice or the injustice of Dickens's position regarding his contracts, it is still true that he was laboring under what Forster called "a nightmare agreement."<sup>7</sup> Most of these contracts had been made before Dickens—or perhaps Bentley, either—was aware of his value as a writer; for the heyday of *Pickwick* had not then arrived. When Dickens realized that his efforts were worth several times what he was receiving it is probable that he became restive, and that this discontented restivity prevented his finishing all of his heavy tasks on time, with the result that he failed to get the material for *Oliver* into the hands of the printer before the latter went to press. It is probable that an examination of an unbound copy of the *Miscellany* for September, 1838, would reveal a note or an announcement that would explain the omission; but at present I can offer only conjecture.

<sup>7</sup> The Dickens-Bentley contracts are fully discussed by Forster and his editor, Mr. J. W. T. Ley, in *The Life of Charles Dickens*, pp. 98 to 100, footnote 101; Walter Dexter, "Dickens's Agreements with Bentley," *The Dickensian*, XXXI (Autumn Number, 1935), 241-254; Dexter, "The Agreements with Richard Bentley," *The Dickensian*, XXXIII (Summer Number, 1937), 199-204; George Bentley, "Mr. Dickens and Mr. Bentley," *The Times* (Friday, December 8, 1871), 6; and Gerald G. Grubb, "Charles Dickens: Journalist," Typewritten Dissertation, The University of North Carolina, 1940, pp. 155-169.

We can now turn to the third point of agreement among the four authorities quoted at the beginning of this note—namely, that the serial publication of *Oliver Twist* came to an end in the March 1839 Number. A glance at the final installment of *Oliver* shows that it appeared not in the March but in the April issue, v, 416-425. Since January 1, 1839, Ainsworth's *Jack Shepherd* had been the leading story in the *Miscellany*, standing at the beginning of each number, and accompanied by a dated etching. This last installment of *Oliver Twist* stands between the *Shepherd* plates for April 1 and May 1, 1839.

GERALD GILES GRUBB

Howard College

#### IVANHOE AND SIMMS' VASCONSELOS

A clear example of the frequently-discussed influence of Scott on Simms<sup>1</sup> seems to be shown by a comparison of the Passage of Arms at Ashby in *Ivanhoe* with the tournament of Havana in *Vasconcelos* (1854), pictured by Simms as immediately preceding the departure of De Soto for Florida. In both of these episodes the scene is elaborately described, with particular attention to the heraldic devices of the contestants; in both, the tourney proper is supplemented by games characteristic of the *locale*—in *Ivanhoe* by an archery contest, in *Vasconcelos* by a bullfight. Both novels employ the chivalric convention of having the victorious knight crowned by a Queen of Beauty whom he has previously chosen, but the details differ: *Ivanhoe* chooses Rowena as Queen after his victory in the individual jousts, and only through the fortunes of combat is he crowned as the hero in the *mêlée* of the second day; *Vasconcelos* must demonstrate his prowess on only one day and is crowned as champion immediately following his selection of Olivia de Alvaro as Queen. In each novel the rewarding of the victor—which brings two lovers face to face—is dramatically interrupted: *Ivanhoe* faints from his wounds, Olivia “from the conflict of emotions which she could no longer sustain and live.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Grace Landrum, “Sir Walter Scott and the Old South,” *American Literature*, II (November, 1930), 261.

<sup>2</sup> *Vasconcelos*, Chapter XIX, p. 247. The “conflict” is between Olivia's love for Philip and her sense of guilt at having been, albeit unwillingly, the victim of her uncle's incestuous lust.



Far more convincing than these general similarities—which might be dismissed as coincidental, even if they were not overlooked among the differences of setting and of the procedure in the tournament—are two similarities in the details of the action. The dramatic moment of the first day at Ashby is the combat between Ivanhoe and Bois-Guilbert. After both combatants break their lances cleanly in the first course, Ivanhoe shifts his attack from shield to helmet, “a mark more difficult to hit, but which, if attained, rendered the shock more irresistible.” The lance-point strikes fairly between the bars of the Norman’s visor, and the bursting of his saddle-girth rolls him ignominiously in the dust.<sup>3</sup> Philip de Vasconselos, after twice shattering lances with his friend Nuno de Tobar, shifts his attack from the shield (“the common mark in the tournament of that day; the want of exercise making the *atteint* more difficult when addressed to the gorget, or the helm”) to the visor—first signalling his intention to his friendly rival. In the charge Philip skilfully handles his shield to avoid De Tobar’s thrust, while his own lance-point, “admirably delivered, was riveted in the bars of his antagonist’s visor, so firmly, and so fairly, that there was no escape, no evasion of it possible; and the gallant Nuno was borne from his saddle.”<sup>4</sup>

In his combat with De Grantmesnil, one of the lesser of the Norman challengers, Ivanhoe exhibits the courtesy, as well as the courage of knighthood. De Grantmesnil’s horse, “young and violent, reared and plunged in the course of his career so as to disturb the rider’s aim.” Ivanhoe, declining the advantage afforded him by this mishap, offers the chance of a second encounter to De Grantmesnil, who declines it, “avowing himself vanquished as much by the courtesy as by the address of his opponent.”<sup>5</sup> A similar incident, though treated in greater detail, occurs in *Vasconselos*, immediately after the overthrow of De Tobar, to save the gallant but portly veteran Don Vasco de Porcallos from the mortification of being unhorsed. “His steed, which was as high-spirited as he was powerful, trod upon the barbed head of a broken lance which had been partly buried out of sight beneath the sands of the arena . . . and . . . became suddenly unmanageable.” More

<sup>3</sup> *Ivanhoe*, Chapter VIII (Oxford, 1912), p. 90.

<sup>4</sup> *Vasconselos*, Chapter XVII, pp. 227-28.

<sup>5</sup> *Ivanhoe*, Chapter VIII, p. 92.

spectacular in his horsemanship than *Ivanhoe*, Vasconcelos suddenly reins in his charger, leaps to the ground, and grasps the bridle of his opponent's horse. Don Vasco alights, "and gratefully acknowledging the assistance rendered, he at the same time acknowledged himself vanquished." Spared some of the disgrace of defeat, the veteran, who has previously distinguished himself in the lists, declines the suggestion of Vasconcelos that he continue the combat on another horse.<sup>6</sup>

That the resemblances between the tournaments are not purely fortuitous may be inferred from Simms' familiarity with *Ivanhoe*, which he cites as a model historical romance in the letter to Professor Dickson, prefatory to the 1854 revision of *The Yemassee*, in the same year in which *Vasconcelos* was published. Furthermore, in the address "History for the Purposes of Art," published nine years earlier, he terms *Ivanhoe* "one of the most perfect specimens of the romance that we possess," with the reservation, expressed in a footnote, that it is "impaired, however, by the single piece of mummery toward the close, which embodies the burial rites of Athelstane and his resurrection. But for this every way unbecoming episode, the romance would be nearly perfect."<sup>7</sup>

It should not be concluded that Simms deliberately set out to imitate Scott's description of the tournament at Ashby. Probably, realizing that he lacked the intimacy with his subject that had characterized his tales of the Southwest and of Revolutionary South Carolina, he turned, consciously or unconsciously, to the author who had popularized the romance of medieval chivalry. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that this elaboration of detail—the rationalization of accidents and the analysis of motives—somewhat destroys the sensation of spirited action which Scott, using his details more sparingly, successfully maintains. A difference in tone is also noticeable: except for the combat between Philip and his brother, following the retirement of Don Vasco, the jousts at Havana are less fierce than those at Ashby. The Spanish and Portuguese knights contest the lists honorably, as befitting one of the last displays of chivalric splendor, but even in the intensity of combat they remember that they are brothers-

<sup>6</sup> *Vasconcelos*, Chapter XVIII, pp. 233-34.

<sup>7</sup> *Views and Reviews in American Literature*, first series (New York, 1845), p. 33.

in-arms; at the height of the feudal age, in a recently conquered country where differences of descent might imply differences of allegiance, the contests in which Ivanhoe distinguished himself—an English knight loyal to King Richard, against the Norman retainers of the usurper John—fall little short of personal duels. But though this difference of tone is proper, a reader of the two accounts is compelled to conclude that it was a mistake for Simms to leave the Southern woods, which he knew from intimate experience, to write about the chivalric tournament, an alien tradition which he could know only through books.

RAVEN I. McDAVID, JR.

*Southwestern Louisiana Institute*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Goethe's Works with the exception of Faust, A Catalogue compiled by members of the Yale University Library staff.* Edited, arranged and supplied with literary notes and preceded by an introduction and a biographical sketch of William A. Speck by CARL FREDERICK SCHREIBER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xlv + 239, 17 plates, folio. \$10.00. [The William A. Speck Collection of Goetheana in the Yale University Library.]

The Goetheana gathered by the late William A. Speck constitute, without doubt, one of the largest and most important Goethe collections not merely in this country, but in the world. The present monumental volume is to be followed by three others, to be devoted respectively to *Faust*, Biographical Material, Addenda, and a General Index. The classification of the material is based in general on Goedeke, with the collected editions of the works at the head, followed by the collections of poems and then by the other works in the order of their composition. With each work are given the translations, illustrations, musical settings and the like. Certain departures from Goedeke's arrangement have deliberately been made, as the editor points out on page xvii:

It seemed to me illuminating to bring together all the materials relating to a given Goethe work; a general survey, let us say, of *Werther*; first the original work; then all that has been done with it in the way of

criticism, translation, illustration, musical composition, dramatization, and parody; and finally to introduce the holograph material bearing on *Werther* at points where it would shed the most light. Surely the *Werther* should then stand forth boldly and vitally. The same is true of the *Werther* illustrations by Chodowiecky which are accompanied by a running comment to point out the history of these charming engravings. A new treatment of the numerous reprintings of the *Werther* translations has been introduced. The life of a translation from the first printing on through the succeeding issues gives a vivid picture of its success with the reading public. . . . The texts of all anonymous issues have been carefully compared and credited to the original translator.

It may be remarked, by the way, that the *Werther* collection is one of the largest ever assembled, more than 600 numbers of the total 2372 being devoted to this work.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Schreiber and his collaborators for the accurate and consistent collation of all the items of any importance—a collation which is not always to be found in such detail in the catalogues of other Goethe collections. It is impossible here to enter into detailed descriptions; I shall limit myself to supplementary data gained by comparison with copies in my own collection.

No. 2. *D. Goethens Schriften Erster Theil*: Title and signature A have been set twice, the first set-up ( $h^{1a}$ ) existing in my two copies, the second ( $h^{1b}$ ) in the copy of Cornell University 1419 A<sup>1</sup>: Page 4, 4 *deinen Freund*  $h^{1a}$  *deinem Freund*  $h^{1b}$  6, 14 *beschäftigten*  $h^{1a}$  *beschäftigen*  $h^{1b}$  6, 23 *dem besten*  $h^{1a}$  *den besten*  $h^{1b}$  8, 12 *zugethan*,  $h^{1a}$  *zugethan!*  $h^{1b}$ . At the end of the *Zweyter Theil* one of my copies contains a leaf (superscription and 9 lines of text) that is missing in the Yale copy, as well as in the collections of Hirzel, Friedrich Meyer, and Kippenberg:

*Nachricht an den Buchbinder*. Da aus Nachlässigkeit des Setzers, mit den Seitenzahlen im 2ten Theil der Fehler begangen worden, daß er statt pagina 230 bis 288, pagina 130 bis 188 gesetzt hat, folglich auch dieser Fehler auf der Kupferplatte des Clavigo und der Elmiere begangen ist, so werden die Herren Buchbinder sich in Acht nehmen, daß sie diese zwey Kupfer auf die gehörigen Seiten bringen.

In the *Dritter Theil* one of my copies has a blank leaf at the end, belonging to signature P. The two plates, missing in the Yale copy, are marked respectively *III. Th. Pag. 85.* and *III. Th. pag. 160.* Each is by *D. Chodowiecki del. D. Berger sc.*

No. 3. *J. W. Goethens Schriften Erster Band*: one of my copies is unbound and unopened, and one can here see that the frontispiece forms the first leaf of signature A: the Yale copy is therefore complete.

No. 12. In addition to a copy conforming to the description in the Catalogue, I possess a second copy as follows: *Goethe's Schriften. Erster [— Vierter] Band*. Vignette: *J. W. Meil inv. del. et sc. Mit Röm. Kaiserl. allergnädigstem Privilegio. Leipzig, bey Georg Joachim Göschen, 1787.* (This date is in all four volumes.)

Following the title, in fact forming a double leaf with it, is a *Kaiserliches allergnädigstes Privilegium* with the date November 8, 1805. The title-pages, despite the date 1787, must therefore have been printed in 1805, or later, and then added to the remainders of the original edition. Textually, volume 1 shows three different printings of signature,\* containing title and *Zueignung*, and three different set-ups of signature Z (pp. 353-360), whilst the rest of the volume is identical in the three copies in my possession. The printing designated by s<sup>1</sup> has the vignette on the title-page marked: *J. W. Meil inv. F. Grögory sc.* In s<sup>2</sup> and s<sup>3</sup> the vignette is marked: *J. W. Meil inv. del. et sc.*; on the title page of s<sup>1</sup> the name of the publisher appears as *Göschel*, in s<sup>2</sup> and s<sup>3</sup> as *Göschen*. In s<sup>1</sup> and s<sup>3</sup> signature Z is marked: *Goethe's W. I. Band*, in s<sup>2</sup> the spelling is *Göthe's W. I. Band*. The extra leaf with the *Privilegium* is found only in s<sup>3</sup>. Characteristic readings are: page vii, 9 *sehnen?* s<sup>1,3</sup>, *sehnen*. s<sup>2</sup> viii, 9 *Verzeih* s<sup>1</sup>, *Verzeih's* s<sup>2,3</sup> x, 4 *frischer-neuter* s<sup>1,3</sup> *frisch erneuter* s<sup>2</sup> x, 5 *Früchten schmückt*, | s<sup>1</sup> *Früchten* | *schmückt*, s<sup>2,3</sup> 353, 16 *läßt's* s<sup>1,3</sup> *laß'ts* s<sup>2</sup> 355, 8 *Meuter* s<sup>1,3</sup> *Meuteer* s<sup>2</sup> 357, 29 *schwere* s<sup>1,2</sup> *schweren* s<sup>3</sup> 358, 8 *Paket* s<sup>1,2</sup> *Packet* s<sup>3</sup>.

Nos. 28-31. Volumes 1-10 of the edition in small octavo exist in as many as three different printings, the characteristics of which cannot be enumerated here: the latest printing can easily be identified by the date 1828 instead of 1827.

Nos. 139 ff. The Yale collection lacks the very first edition of the Poems: *Goethe's Gedichte. Tübingen in der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung*. 1812. 4 leaves, 408 pages. 26 signatures, the last with only 4 leaves. The text is identical with that of A<sup>2</sup> of the *Werke* of 1806, only the signatures having been changed from *Goethe's Werke. I.* to: *Goethe's Gedichte*. Both editions have the incorrect page number 313 instead of 331.

No. 143. The text of the *Gedichte* of 1815, despite the different number of pages, is from the same set-up as volumes 1 and 2 of the *Werke* of this year; cf. *MLN.*, xxxi, 278.

No. 146. That Goethe had no hand in the publication of the *Gedichte* of 1829 is indicated by a remark in his letter to Cotta of October 27, 1829 (*Briefe* XLVI, 124): "Von meinen kleinen *Gedichten* und von *Hermann und Dorothea* sind neuerlich, wie ich sehe, einzelne Abdrücke erschienen. Hiervon möchte ich Dieselben um einige Exemplare ansprechen."

Nos. 700, 701. Two copies of *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*, 1773, are listed, with the statement for 701: "Page number on p. 8 not printed." What we should like to know is, whether these two copies constitute different printings (which have hitherto been unknown), or whether it is the same set-up, with just this otherwise unimportant difference in pagination?

No. 949. The date of *Der Teutsche Merkur* is put in brackets [1773], as if it had been supplied by the editor: in four copies

before me the date is given; moreover, volumes 1 and 2 have *Deutsche*, and not *Teutsche*.

Nos. 1713, 1714. *Scherz, List und Rache*. It would be interesting to know whether these two copies, one of which is simply called "Variant," are from the same set-up or not. My copy has the reading *Er ist bitter* of No. 1713, and the correct pagination of No. 1714.

No. 2163. The *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, 1814, whose place of publication is given in the catalogue as *Stuttgart* (with a question mark), actually has on its title-page the imprint: *Tübingen*.

W. KURRELMEYER

---

*Chaucer's Troilus, A Study in Courtly Love*. By THOMAS A. KIRBY. (Louisiana State University Studies, No. 39) University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1940. Pp. ix + 337. \$3.00.

The purpose of this monograph, as stated in the Preface, is "to make a study of the courtly love tradition and of Chaucer's *Troilus* in the light of that tradition, especially to investigate its relation to the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio and to determine the nature and the effect of the changes which the English poet saw fit to make."

Part I (87 pages) reviews the origins and development of the conventions of courtly love, with chapters on Ovid, the Troubadours, Chrétien de Troyes, Andreas Capellanus, and the authors of the *dolce stil nuovo* in Italy. These chapters, based on a first-hand examination of the texts concerned supplemented by generous quotations from the best modern scholars who have discussed them, gives a scholarly conspectus of the subject which will be very useful to graduate students who may wish to get it up in preparation for the ordeal of a doctoral examination. One is surprised to find no treatment of the *Roman de la Rose*, which Professor Kirby has deliberately excluded as not "especially significant" for his purposes.

Part II (28 pages) consists of a single chapter devoted to the *Filostrato* as "a typical courtly love document." This is perhaps the most useful chapter of the book. Boccaccio's graceful poem has usually been discussed chiefly as a foil to Chaucer's much more brilliant reworking of it. Here it is analyzed as a narrative poem in its own right, all reference to Chaucer being reserved for later chapters. The student of *Troilus* will find it much to his advantage to read this single-eyed analysis of its Italian original.

Part III (164 pages) is devoted to a minutely detailed analysis of Chaucer's *Troilus*. Long chapters are devoted to the characters



of Pandarus, Criseyde, and Troilus, with a short chapter on Diomedes. The structural pattern of each of these chapters is the same: the actions and utterances of each character in turn are exhaustively reviewed from first appearance to last; in every episode the extent to which Chaucer follows or departs from his Italian model is pointed out; by careful reference to the pronouncements of Andreas Capellanus, who is assumed to speak with final and indisputable authority on everything pertaining to courtly love, it is discovered that in most instances Chaucer has enhanced the courtliness of the love story. This is a conclusion which few competent critics would dispute in its main contention, though they may question some of the detailed demonstrations.

The method which Mr. Kirby has chosen for his exposition has some serious disadvantages. Page after page of alternating quotation and summary paraphrase makes for dreary reading. (Pandarus requires 71 pages and Criseyde an ensuing 54). The separate examination of the chief personages involves some unfortunate repetition, and, a more serious matter, leaves little opportunity to assess the tone and temper of Chaucer's poem in its total impression upon the reader. The analysis of the characters tends to the mechanical rather than the imaginative. Pandarus is absolved of all obloquy as go-between because Andreas Capellanus permits an *internuntius*. Would he have thought that the lady's guardian uncle could appropriately fill the rôle? Troilus's long discussion of predestination is justified on the ground that courtly love is "quite opposed to freedom of the will" because, "as the slave of his lady, [the lover] is absolutely powerless and is able to do nothing of his own choice" (p. 262). Criseyde is to be condemned "solely because in granting her love to Diomedes she offends against one of the cardinal principles of the courtly love system" (p. 231). But is not failure to keep one's solemnly plighted faith cause for condemnation under most codes of human behavior? If she is "the greatest of courtly love heroines" (p. 237), why does the God of Love in the *Legend of Good Women* rebuke Chaucer for writing of her?

One would be glad to know how whole-heartedly Chaucer accepted as humanly valid the conventions of courtly love as codified, two hundred years before his time, by Andrew the Chaplain. Were they applicable at the court of Richard II, or did they suggest rather the long-ago days of King Arthur and the more distant romantic past of ancient Troy or Athens? There is, at least, plenty of evidence in Chaucer's poetry that he did not agree with Andrew that courtly love is necessarily incompatible with marriage.

ROBERT K. ROOT

Princeton University

*Civilisation Américaine.* By BERNARD FAÏ. Paris: Sagittaire, 1939. Pp. 329. 30 fr.

*The Small Town in American Literature.* By IMA HONAKER HERRON. Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 477. \$4.00.

*The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century.* By PERRY MILLER. New York: Macmillan, 1939. Pp. xi + 528. \$3.75.

Although these three volumes are concerned with various aspects of the American mind, they present striking contrasts in scope and method. *Civilisation Américaine*, a panorama of our complex democracy, is an example of the peculiarly French powers of broad synthesis and shrewd analysis. *The Small Town in American Literature* is a carefully documented account of the village pattern in our national letters from the third quarter of the eighteenth century to the present time. Easily the most distinguished is *The New England Mind*, a brilliant dissection of the anatomy of Puritan thought as it is revealed in the outpouring of literature in seventeenth century England and America.

The slightest of these studies has the most ambitious aim. In a lively book of three hundred pages, M. FaÏ has attempted to cope with the vast subject of American civilization. From Harvard to Hollywood, the author's witty and often penetrating commentary ranges over a variety of topics. Illuminating as many of these comments are, American readers will be likely to offer amused protests at the statement (p. 216) that several members of the Princeton faculty were seriously alarmed at the "invasion" of New Jersey by "inhabitants" from Mars. Equally open to objection is the observation (p. 247) that *True Confessions* and other magazines of this spawn are only a trifle less respectable than *The Saturday Evening Post*. Pleasantly flattering, but uninformed, is the remark (p. 195) that the New York Times is piously read each morning by plumbers and negro chamber-maids. M. FaÏ's charge that American literature is neglected by our students, less true now than a decade ago, is not without some foundation in fact. He also deplores the over-emphasis upon English literary history at the expense of American literary history which remains a spattering of names without much reference to the special conditions which produced them. This is shrewd criticism, but the author devotes a scant thirteen pages to contemporary letters, approximately a third of the space given to journalism. Although M. FaÏ considers American drama to be the most vital of our arts, he dismisses Eugene O'Neill (whose name is misspelled) in less than three lines.

The author was badly served by his proof-reader. It is disconcerting to encounter a temperamental version of names as important

as Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Harrison, Charles Eliot, James Bryant Conant, Edith Wharton, Willa Cather, John Dos Passos, William Faulkner, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Singer Sargent, and George Gershwin. The index is far from adequate. These faults are perhaps captious in as disarming a book as *Civilisation Américaine*. If M. Fay has not exhausted his subject, neither has he exhausted his reader. He has offered a bright, and, in the main, a generous estimate of contemporary life in the United States.

Popular criticism has too often assumed that "the home town mind" was first attacked in such comparatively recent works as *Spoon River Anthology* and *Main Street*. This impression has been happily corrected by Dr. Herron in *The Small Town in American Literature*. Although she does not maintain that the small town has played as significant a part as the frontier, her thoroughgoing survey deserves a place beside the earlier works upon the importance of frontier and prairie in the revaluation of American literature. The literary evolution of the small town and its prototype, the village, is traced through three stages: first, that of eighteenth century imitations of the pattern of English village life; second, that of the shifting conventions and backgrounds motivated by the recession of the frontier; and, third, the spread of the urban spirit with its drab aftermath of standardization. Dr. Herron sees in the present day "return to the land" by disillusioned city folk a new chapter in "the variously patterned story of convention and revolt." This study possesses all the virtues and very few of the vices of the monograph method. It is meticulously documented; it offers a wealth of suggestive bibliographical information; it neglects none of the important attitudes to small town ways; and, above all, it illuminates as well as covers the subject. The author's absorbing interest in her theme, however, tempted her occasionally to over-emphasize the factor of setting in works which are concerned only incidentally with environment. Although she is aware of the limitations of her "historical-geographical approach" to the subject, this method has resulted in a considerable amount of repetition. Moreover, interpretative commentary is sometimes sacrificed in order to include a spattering of titles which might have been more properly reserved for the bibliography.

Although Dr. Herron found fiction to offer the richest source of evidence, she has not done full justice to the revelation of the small town mind in the popular, sentimental, and occasionally sub-literary novels of the 1840's and 1850's. The very few inaccuracies are minor ones. *Alonzo and Melissa* should have been attributed to Isaac Mitchell, not to Daniel Jackson. It appeared in 1811, not in 1824. Such slips in no way detract from the high competence of the study, which should prove eminently useful to students of American social and literary history.

Historians of American literature have been too intent upon esthetic values and too exclusively concerned with *belles-lettres* to explore thoroughly and sympathetically the thorny province of our intellectual origins. As a result, beginnings of American thought have usually been dismissed as flat and unprofitable. It is the chief significance of Dr. Perry Miller's *The New England Mind* that it provides a magnificently analytical appraisal of the amalgam of Puritan thought in the seventeenth century. Interpreters of our national mind have neglected the fact that its roots are firmly planted in the seventeenth century. Professor Miller has taken Puritanism for granted as "one of the major expressions of the Western intellect" and he has assumed "that it achieved an organized synthesis of concepts which are fundamental to our culture." In his task of classifying and defining these concepts, the author has resorted to a topical analysis of leading ideas under the general divisions of Religion and Learning, Cosmology, Anthropology, and Sociology. Faced with the problem of finding modern equivalents for the Puritan philosophical and theological vocabulary, Dr. Miller wisely refused to translate seventeenth century terminology into contemporary phrases. Instead, he has been triumphantly successful in clarifying the "state of mind" of the Puritans as the best means of arriving at the issues which agitated Puritan thought.

Students nurtured on the old commonplaces will find many of their tenets challenged at every turn. It is only when the New Englanders are studied as heirs of the Renaissance, as disciples of Erasmus and Colet, and as eager students of classical literature, that the inadequacy of the traditional label of Calvinism as a measure of their intellectual life becomes apparent. The author has gone far to explain the seeming paradox that "Puritan writers can pity the insignificance of human reason, and in the next breath sing the praises of the human mind." Without minimizing the dominant strain of piety, Dr. Miller has demonstrated the "toughness" of the rational element which construed conversion as "an enlightening of the mind" as well as "a humbling of the heart." The author's wide scrutiny of the whole range of Puritan writing is never so impressive as in his demonstration of the importance of the intellectual heritage in molding the life of New England.

As important a book as *The New England Mind* deserves a separate review and a more searching analysis than the limitations of this short notice allow. Professor Miller has written a definitive chapter in the history of ideas, and has made a distinguished contribution to American scholarship.

HERBERT BROWN

Bowdoin College

---

*Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800.* By WILLARD AUSTIN KINNE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi + 310. \$3.00.

The scope of this study, suggested by its title, is more specifically indicated by the author's statement of his purpose: "to give a year-to-year account of those acted comedies or comic entertainments which were either avowedly drawn from France or were ascribed to a French source by eighteenth-century reviewers" (p. ix). Limiting himself to the half century from the London theatrical season of 1749-1750 to that of 1799-1800, Mr. Kinne has systematically considered not only the new comedies which were indebted to French sources but also the pieces which, although first produced before 1749-1750, were revived during or after that season. The year-to-year account is organized into five chapters, each of which covers a decade; within each chapter he first discusses the revivals, usually in chronological order of their reappearance upon the stage, and then the new plays.

Within these chapters Mr. Kinne has given a useful and highly informative guide to the comedies which he found to be indebted, in great or small degree, to the French theatre. For each play he states the principal sources, and for the more important or more popular ones he analyzes the differences in plot or structure between the French source and the English version. These detailed comparisons are among the most useful portions of the book. For each play Mr. Kinne also gives an account of its popularity upon the stage during the decade in which it was first revived or performed, a list of the theatrical seasons in which it was later offered in London, and a bibliography of editions. Occasionally he discusses the critical or popular reception of the new or revived play. Nevertheless, although Mr. Kinne offers a considerable body of detailed information and interesting interpretation bearing upon French influences upon English comedy, one wishes that the five pages of Chapter VII ("Conclusion") had been extended to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the meaning of the facts presented in the earlier chapters. In addition, since the study is in part a reference guide to the sources and popularity of individual plays, an index to the pieces by title (there is one for names of persons only) would have facilitated greatly the reader's finding the discussion of a specific play.

In only one phase of his discussion, however, does Mr. Kinne appear to be inaccurate; his accounts of the stage popularity of some of the plays have been compiled from sources which are incomplete and from these data he has drawn an occasional conclusion which is not valid. From Chapter II (1749-1760) a few examples may be drawn. For *The Busie Body* (p. 18) he lists thirty-seven performances in London during 1749-1760; the playbills in the Huntington Library indicate that there were thirty-four per-

formances of it in Drury Lane and thirteen in Covent Garden, a total of forty-seven. For *The Mock Doctor* (p. 20) he lists twenty-nine performances in Drury Lane but overlooks twenty-five in Covent Garden. For *The Miser* (p. 37) he records forty-four performances, but there seem to have been fifty. Thus, his statement (p. 37) that *The Miser* ranks first and *The Mock Doctor* third among the nine adaptations from Molière during the decade reverses the relative popularity of the two pieces. In Chapter III (1760-1770) his account of *The Country Girl* similarly understates its frequency of performance. Whereas he has counted in *The Gentleman's Magazine* sixty-nine offerings of the comedy from 1785 to 1800 (p. 71) the theatrical advertisements in the newspapers and playbills in the British Museum announce eighty-nine performances. In discussing the acting in this play he overstates a point, for he says (p. 70) that from 1785 to 1800 *The Country Girl* was the "exclusive property" of King (acting Moody) and Mrs. Jordan (acting Peggy); he overlooks the fact that Bensley, Wroughton, Swendall, and Dowton occasionally acted Moody in that period and that on a few evenings Mrs. Wilson and Miss Molina acted Peggy when Mrs. Jordan was absent from the company. He is right, however, in attributing the success of the comedy to the skill of Mrs. Jordan's acting. From a later chapter (v: 1780-1790) may be taken a last example. For *Barnaby Rudge* (p. 162) he lists the following performances: 1782, five; 1785, two; 1786, one; etc. A more complete count reveals the following number: 1782, fourteen; 1783, eight; 1784, six; 1785, five. Although Mr. Kinne similarly understates the number of performances of some other plays, the stage popularity of the comedies is not his major concern and otherwise the work seems free from errors.

EMMETT L. AVERY

State College of Washington

---

*A Map of Old English Monasteries and related ecclesiastical Foundations: A. D. 400-1066.* By ALICE M. RYAN. (Cornell Studies in English XXVIII). Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1939. Pp. vi + [36], with black-and-white map in pocket inside front cover. \$1.00.

In constructing a clear and nicely executed map showing the location of monasteries and other ecclesiastical sites of pre-Norman England Dr. Ryan has performed a good service for students of English cultural history. This map supplements significantly the Ordnance Survey map of *Britain in the Dark Ages* (A. D. 410-871) and is a welcome addition to the distinguished series in which it



appears—the first Cornell study connected in any substantial way with medieval England.

The map is supported by an index (pp. 9-28) of the 325 odd sites marked on the map and by a combined bibliography and key to abbreviations (pp. 29-33). Nearly one hundred of the items are crosses (reflecting former graveyards and churches?). The Celtic areas of Britain, except Cornwall with its strikingly dense concentration of religious houses, in the main await future treatment (cp. p. 6 bottom). Under the main entry of many of the names a considerable bibliography has been collected with useful references to Dugdale, the Victoria County History, charters, Domesday Book and other primary and secondary works.

The one real out about the work seems to me to be essentially in the spellings chosen for the map and as the main entry in the index. These are Old English though, as in the Ordnance Survey maps of *Roman Britain* and of *Britain in the Dark Ages* (quaint title!), the modern forms where known are included in the index-alphabet with cross-references to the OE key-form (map-form). As in the Ordnance Survey maps the principle adopted is essentially to cite the oldest recorded form: here Bede's Latin text looms large, then charters, the OE Annals etc. in a chronologically ascending scale. In practice this system works out very irregularly and yields a spotty, motley effect. Where, for instance, nom. and oblique cases by the luck of the draw jostle shoulders, we get such disparities as *Bancornaburg*, *Cungresbyri*, *Heanbyrg* (St), *Sceaftesbyrig*; all should, of course, be reduced to *-burh*. *Couæntree* (map), *Couæntre* (index) is a poor form to choose vs. the available *Cofantreo*. Similar inconsistencies might be multiplied considerably and should in a new edition be eliminated by a reduction to a West-Saxon norm. But the names on the map itself should certainly be in modern English; for, after all, map and book is going to be of most use to historians of art, archaeology and church history, most of whom have little knowledge of and less interest in OE *per se*.

Trivia follow. County identification, please, even for the sites of crosses! Not *Adbaruae* and, but *ad Baruae*; so similar syntactical combinations. "Bangor Isycoed" is the official, Bartholomew name for *Bancornaburg*. *Beadingaham* is wrongly alphabetized. Yorkshire names should specify the Ridings; so, e.g. *Crec* YN, not just plain Y; this distinction is conventional even in non-philological life. "Crowland" is, I think, preferable to "Croyland." Scottish names, where Celtic, should include where pertinent a reference to W. J. Watson, *The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1926), e.g. under *Dull*. *Elmete*, an old district in YW, whose name is preserved in Elmet Hall near Leeds, is not identified. *Enli*, l. 2: read "-mitage." *Herulford*: Bede *HE*. *Hii* is inadequately located; see Bartholomew

under "Iona." Not Lewesham but Lewisham, which is, by the way, now in the co. of London, though formerly in Kent. *Mailros* (i. e. Melrose, Roxburghshire) of the map seems to be missing in the index. *Myresig* is in Ess not Ex! *Theodford* is surely Thetford (Nf), not Tetford (Li).

Once again: a good and useful work.

F. P. MAGOUN

Harvard University

---

*The American Novel.* By CARL VAN DOREN. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940. Pp. viii + 406. \$2.25.

*Hardy of Wessex: His Life and Literary Career.* By CARL J. WEBER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. vii + 302. \$3.00.

Carl van Doren is the most eminent and indispensable historian of American fiction. The present book is an extension of his earlier work comprised in *The American Novel*, 1921, and *Contemporary American Novelists*, 1922, so as to include a view of novels which have appeared during the last twenty years. The present revision and enlargement is amply justified by the volume and quality of recent fiction. It is admirably proportioned and weighted, judicious and discriminating in critical estimates, comprehensive enough for all but extreme specialists, and written in a style of impeccable competence and suavity, conventional without banality and summary without shallowness. It has the merits as well as the limitations of an inclusive historical survey, conducted with scholarly thoroughness and without partiality. Justice is done to writers of all schools and genres, from Cooper or Melville to Howells, from Dreiser or Stephen Crane to Willa Cather; and lesser figures are placed in due perspective. If the leaders of the present moment are somewhat sketchily presented, it is obviously because Mr. van Doren does not choose to be carried away by what may prove to be the rash enthusiasm of a period. He never loses his head. A temper so unpartisan may not make for the most provocative of "creative" criticism, but it admirably serves the aims of critical history.

Professor Weber's *Hardy of Wessex* is a skilful selective summary of biographical data elsewhere accessible, greatly enriched with a large body of information of his own industrious gathering. He is particularly illuminating on what we might call technical matters—methods of composition, conditions of publication, early experiments, bibliographical oddities, sources of suggestion for characters and incidents (as in *Tess*), literary sources and influences, topography, time-charts for the action of the novels, etc. But

he makes excellent use of such information for the larger interpretation of Hardy's art and mentality. Highly interesting on the biographical side is his account of Hardy's first wife—paragon of vanity, silliness, and Victorian narrowness of mind—with whom the large-minded genius bore so patiently for so many years, and whom he mourned so almost inconsolably after her death. Mr. Weber is, I may add, too polite and charitable to characterize the lady in terms so blunt. His approach to Hardy is intelligently worshipful and understanding. He shows us a man honest, simple, and lovable; a thinker of grave and mournful seriousness with a sharp and immitigable drive towards truth; modest inventor of tales for public consumption, skilful in fitting and joining; artist in whom a realism shocking to his contemporaries was dominated and harmonized by a tender humanism and a profound instinct for beauty. While *Hardy of Wessex* will not displace the official biography by Hardy's widow, it forms an invaluable supplement to it, and is a work indispensable to all devoted lovers and students of Hardy.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

University of Minnesota

---

*Humanism and Imagination.* By G. R. ELLIOTT. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. x + 253. \$2.50.

In 1929 Professor Elliott published a volume of essays, *The Cycle of Modern Poetry*, which was characterized by acute thinking but was more difficult to read than the substance seemed to warrant. The present volume is still more difficult and less acute. The book is made up of essays and reviews originally written for periodicals; and part of the reader's trouble arises from the fact that the pieces do not fit together into a whole, although they are arranged in chapters to look like a connected treatment of an interesting subject. Two of the essays (or chapters) are valuable—those entitled "Irving Babbitt as I Knew Him" and "Stuart Sherman and the War Age." Professor Elliott's picture of Babbitt is arresting, and is a truly and finely drawn portrait (with a considerable amount of G. R. E. thrown in, here and throughout the book). It is the more worth having because Babbitt notoriously failed to embody himself fully in his own books. With all his failures and limitations, he was one of the most remarkable Americans of the last generation; and as a university teacher he had the unusual qualification of being at once stimulating and solid. The reminiscences of his friends, therefore, are a service, not so much to his memory, as to those who had not the good fortune to know him personally. And amongst

such reminiscences, of which a number have been published and more are in prospect, Professor Elliott's take an important place.

Professor Elliott's essay on Sherman is a sound piece of criticism. Sherman was a writer of brilliant promise who fizzled out. Professor Elliott explains the mystery, and shows a talent for discrimination which one wishes he could exercise more consistently. For the remainder of this book falls a good deal below the level of the pages on Sherman and Babbitt. There is an essay on "Paul E. More and the Gentle Reader" which is, compared with the essay on Babbitt, an opportunity missed. Here and throughout the remainder of the book the prime difficulty is that Professor Elliott has several unharmonized aims. He wants to draw a portrait of More, but he also wants to lower More as a means of raising Babbitt (and himself); he wants to exhibit his own brand of Catholicism as something superior to the faiths of both More and Babbitt; he wants to present the "spirit of poetry" as a continuing stream of revealed truth; he wants to show that he is a professor with the rest of them and something better. He is able to mingle without uniting these aims because his own beliefs are deliberately vague. But a tenacious refusal to clear one's mind is not a serviceable step towards a successful book; and the "imagination" in the above title serves mainly to suggest the question what Professor Elliott imagined readers would be able to make of his muddled ruminations and reflections.

ROBERT SHAFER

*University of Cincinnati*

---

*The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence.* Edited by W. S. LEWIS. Volumes III-VIII: *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiart.* Edited by W. S. LEWIS AND WARREN HUNTING SMITH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. lxxxviii + 407, 497, 439, 502, 461, ix + 561. \$45.00.

The Yale Edition of Walpole's Correspondence, initiated three years ago by two volumes containing the correspondence with William Cole, is now augmented by six handsome volumes devoted to Madame du Deffand. This correspondence, extending from 1766 to 1780, has survived only in a very one-sided form. Out of about 1700 letters which must have been written only 955 now exist in whole or in part. Of the surviving letters 840 are from Madame du Deffand. Nearly all of Walpole's letters have perished—some were destroyed by Madame du Deffand, and others which she had returned to him were destroyed, probably at his direction, by his

protégée, Mary Berry, after his death. Six of his letters have been preserved in their original form, twelve exist in copies made by agents of the French Secret Service. Fragments of some 87 others survive, chiefly as quotations in the footnotes to Miss Berry's 1810 edition of *Madame du Deffand*. At least 700 letters have perished completely. The originals of all but a dozen of the letters of the blind French lady are preserved in the Bodleian.

This voluminous correspondence, which exhibits a lively and entertaining picture of Parisian society in the last decades of the *ancien régime*, reveals with decorous reserve the mind and personality of the writer, and mirror-fashion reflects one of the many aspects of Walpole's own character, was very competently edited in three stout octavo volumes by Mrs. Paget Toynbee in 1912. To the correspondence as there printed the Yale Edition has been able to add one long hitherto unpublished letter of Madame du Deffand; three hitherto unpublished letters from Walpole; three short paragraphs, a dozen sentences, and a few phrases or clauses which for some reason or other Mrs. Toynbee had silently omitted; and a few fragments of letters from Walpole quoted by Madame du Deffand in letters to other correspondents. The sum total of the additions to the correspondence amounts to less than fifteen pages. Other new significant material, however, is found in the journals which Walpole kept during his various visits to Paris (160 pages), and in Madame du Deffand's journal of the last year of her life (40 pages). These Paris journals of Walpole, of which only a few excerpts have hitherto been printed, give a detailed itinerary, stage by stage, of each of his journeys between London and Paris and record all his social engagements—the plays and operas he attended, where he dined and supped and in what company—during each of his five visits to the French capital.

The foot-note annotations are a model of what such a commentary should be. Walpole's own marginal notations on the originals and the notes of Miss Berry and Mrs. Toynbee are retained with indication of their source, together with much valuable material supplied by the present editors. The reader finds that all his reasonable queries are adequately but concisely answered, without any superfluous display of erudition. There is an amazingly full and minutely analyzed index of names and topics in a convenient single alphabet which fills no less than 343 closely printed pages.

In a review for *MLN* of the Cole volumes of the Yale Walpole the present reviewer expressed a regret that the editors had silently normalized and modernized the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the originals. In the case of Madame du Deffand's letters there is, perhaps, a greater measure of justification for this procedure since, with very few exceptions, the originals are in the hand of an amanuensis, usually M. Wiart, rather than in that of the blind lady herself. But readers who are at home in the French

such reminiscences, of which a number have been published and more are in prospect, Professor Elliott's take an important place.

Professor Elliott's essay on Sherman is a sound piece of criticism. Sherman was a writer of brilliant promise who fizzled out. Professor Elliott explains the mystery, and shows a talent for discrimination which one wishes he could exercise more consistently. For the remainder of this book falls a good deal below the level of the pages on Sherman and Babbitt. There is an essay on "Paul E. More and the Gentle Reader" which is, compared with the essay on Babbitt, an opportunity missed. Here and throughout the remainder of the book the prime difficulty is that Professor Elliott has several unharmonized aims. He wants to draw a portrait of More, but he also wants to lower More as a means of raising Babbitt (and himself); he wants to exhibit his own brand of Catholicism as something superior to the faiths of both More and Babbitt; he wants to present the "spirit of poetry" as a continuing stream of revealed truth; he wants to show that he is a professor with the rest of them and something better. He is able to mingle without uniting these aims because his own beliefs are deliberately vague. But a tenacious refusal to clear one's mind is not a serviceable step towards a successful book; and the "imagination" in the above title serves mainly to suggest the question what Professor Elliott imagined readers would be able to make of his muddled ruminations and reflections.

ROBERT SHAFER

*University of Cincinnati*

---

*The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence.* Edited by W. S. LEWIS. Volumes III-VIII: *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiart.* Edited by W. S. LEWIS AND WARREN HUNTING SMITH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. lxxxviii + 407, 497, 439, 502, 461, ix + 561. \$45.00.

The Yale Edition of Walpole's Correspondence, initiated three years ago by two volumes containing the correspondence with William Cole, is now augmented by six handsome volumes devoted to Madame du Deffand. This correspondence, extending from 1766 to 1780, has survived only in a very one-sided form. Out of about 1700 letters which must have been written only 955 now exist in whole or in part. Of the surviving letters 840 are from Madame du Deffand. Nearly all of Walpole's letters have perished—some were destroyed by Madame du Deffand, and others which she had returned to him were destroyed, probably at his direction, by his



protégée, Mary Berry, after his death. Six of his letters have been preserved in their original form, twelve exist in copies made by agents of the French Secret Service. Fragments of some 87 others survive, chiefly as quotations in the footnotes to Miss Berry's 1810 edition of *Madame du Deffand*. At least 700 letters have perished completely. The originals of all but a dozen of the letters of the blind French lady are preserved in the Bodleian.

This voluminous correspondence, which exhibits a lively and entertaining picture of Parisian society in the last decades of the *ancien régime*, reveals with decorous reserve the mind and personality of the writer, and mirror-fashion reflects one of the many aspects of Walpole's own character, was very competently edited in three stout octavo volumes by Mrs. Paget Toynbee in 1912. To the correspondence as there printed the Yale Edition has been able to add one long hitherto unpublished letter of Madame du Deffand; three hitherto unpublished letters from Walpole; three short paragraphs, a dozen sentences, and a few phrases or clauses which for some reason or other Mrs. Toynbee had silently omitted; and a few fragments of letters from Walpole quoted by Madame du Deffand in letters to other correspondents. The sum total of the additions to the correspondence amounts to less than fifteen pages. Other new significant material, however, is found in the journals which Walpole kept during his various visits to Paris (160 pages), and in Madame du Deffand's journal of the last year of her life (40 pages). These Paris journals of Walpole, of which only a few excerpts have hitherto been printed, give a detailed itinerary, stage by stage, of each of his journeys between London and Paris and record all his social engagements—the plays and operas he attended, where he dined and supped and in what company—during each of his five visits to the French capital.

The foot-note annotations are a model of what such a commentary should be. Walpole's own marginal notations on the originals and the notes of Miss Berry and Mrs. Toynbee are retained with indication of their source, together with much valuable material supplied by the present editors. The reader finds that all his reasonable queries are adequately but concisely answered, without any superfluous display of erudition. There is an amazingly full and minutely analyzed index of names and topics in a convenient single alphabet which fills no less than 343 closely printed pages.

In a review for *MLN* of the Cole volumes of the Yale Walpole the present reviewer expressed a regret that the editors had silently normalized and modernized the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the originals. In the case of Madame du Deffand's letters there is, perhaps, a greater measure of justification for this procedure since, with very few exceptions, the originals are in the hand of an amanuensis, usually M. Wiart, rather than in that of the blind lady herself. But readers who are at home in the French

of the eighteenth century may be disturbed rather than pleased to find such modern spellings as *voulais* for the older *voulois*.

Mr. Lewis, his collaborating editor Mr. Warren Hunting Smith, and the authorities of the Yale University Press are again to be congratulated at this latest step forward in the great undertaking of the Yale Walpole.

ROBERT K. ROOT

*Princeton University*

---

*From Donne to Dryden: The Revolt Against Metaphysical Poetry.*

By ROBERT LATHROP SHARP. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 221. \$3.00.

Sharp is responsible for a useful book. I should hesitate to say that he has *written* a useful book, for the best things in it are loan exhibits: by virtue, it is an anthology of passages from metaphysicals and neoclassicists, a portable repertory of what the metaphysicals thought of themselves and what the neoclassicists thought of them. As Sharp points out, the adherents to the "Donne tradition" attempted no reasoned defense of their poetics, a silence which invites, without receiving, explanatory speculation; but, besides Carew's elegy on Donne, properly treated by Williamson as the closest equivalent to such an "apology," there are many brief self-characterizations to be collected, as Sharp has (for the first time) collected them, and there are what may be called party terms and party phrases which Sharp is the first to have set in relief: "strong lines," "masculine style," and "metaphysical" (a word used by the "conceited" poets in a not purely literary, but in a literarily significant, sense). Almost equally useful, to the historian of poetry, is the much longer assemblage of neoclassical pronouncements upon the characteristic features of the metaphysical style as pejoratively named: its *extravagance*, *harshness*, and *obscurity*. From both groups, citations are drawn from relatively unfrequented sources,—especially the laudatory verses prefaced to volumes of poetry.

Here wholehearted praise must end. The intention is to be critical as well as historical; and the author shows a commendable acquaintance with Empson, Eliot, and the like. But—though this is nowhere clearly announced—his study of the transition is chiefly an historical study of the "critical" transition, not a critical study of the poetic transition: the book is not, that is, a superiorly informed equivalent of Gosse's *From Shakespeare to Pope*, and includes no equivalent of such metrical and rhetorical studies as Miss Wallerstein's and Mr. Williamson's. Nor are there any new ideas in explanation of its thesis: the revolt to be explained

"by reference to both literary and nonliterary forces" is accounted for in terms by now familiar to scholars: the rise of natural science and the Royal Society; the rise of Puritanism; the rise of Hobbes and Locke. What we are offered is a restatement of Richard Jones, William Haller, Basil Willey.

As a critic, Sharp seems confused. His own sympathies and even principles oscillate curiously, so that one does not know, except by counting the pro-metaphysical and pro-neoclassical passages, where the author stands. He takes neither a purely historical and determinist position, nor a consistently partisan position, nor some position which is independent of the issues as set. Predominantly influenced by Eliot, he can refer seriously to A. E. Housman's opposite theory of poetry as though one were reconcilable with the other. From first to last he uses critical and philosophical terms with a suspicious nonchalance: talks about poetic "sincerity" without analyzing that most precarious of concepts; talks about the religious poets' "neglect of reality" as though something like the central issue weren't, precisely, "What is reality?"; alleges that the "partiality of the metaphysicals for abstractions . . . became displeasing to a scientific age," as though Science were not the Queen of Abstractionism. He does the strangest things to words like *abstract*, *general*, and *particular*. The book, in short, is an historically useful anthology accompanied by matter either familiar or immaturely construed.

AUSTIN WARREN

University of Iowa

---

*Charles Reade, Sa Vie, Ses Romans.* By LÉONE RIVES. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine, 1940. Pp. 528.

*It's Never Too Late to Mend*, an edition of Charles Reade's unpublished drama, with an introduction and notes. By LÉONE RIVES. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine, 1940. Pp. 111.

The present large French volume, dedicated to Paul Dottin, treats systematically both Reade's life and his novels and presents much new material. "We have endeavored," Dr. Rives declares in the preface, "to be the comprehensive biographer needed by a man like Reade. To bring out his characteristics, we have used, almost wholly, his intimate papers, his unpublished letters, and finally the enormous mass of his note-books, the reading of which proves fruitful."

The first part of the volume is devoted to Reade's life and throws new light on many of his aspects. The discussion, for instance, of the Puritanical character of the novelist's mother is illuminating. Again, the writer holds that Reade's relationship to Mrs. Seymour,

motives of the characters or recognize and appreciate a dramatic situation. Consequently her use of quotations to prove her point is occasionally misleading. She forgets, for example, that Matthias was slightly drunk when he said,

Where are the mysteries in us that require  
So much dramatic fuss?

Such failures in insight or errors in interpretation do not invalidate Miss Kaplan's main thesis. Her book, after all, is not literary criticism but philosophical analysis. But in presenting Robinson the thinker, it is a pity to represent incorrectly or inadequately Robinson the poet.

*Goucher College*

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

### BRIEF MENTION

*The Art of Satire.* By DAVID WORCESTER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 194. \$1.75. This is an entertaining and often brilliantly written little volume. The author's object is to classify the various literary incarnations of the "volatile and Protean spirit" of satire. He has written chapters on "Invective," "Burlesque," "Irony, the ally of Comedy," "Irony, the ally of Tragedy," and "The evolution of English satire." These form the main divisions of his subject, but within each of the chapters he multiplies distinctions, so that he discovers, for example, nine sorts of burlesque. Seldom, however, are his distinctions forced or arid. He has made them in order to examine in detail the rhetorical principles governing each type of satire. In this task Mr. Worcester has been very successful. In a trenchant phrase he often clears the ground of much debris of familiar and futile argument. "When we dislike irony," he writes, "we call it sarcasm." That disposes of a tortured subject of discussion once and for all.

Inevitably a person who strives to make his language constantly simple and striking is occasionally inept. Some of Mr. Worcester's carefully wrought antitheses are merely verbal. "What we are faced with in high burlesque," he writes, "is a simile in reverse, a simile without a similitude." Only occasionally does he fall into strained cleverness and bad taste, as when he says "Irony is the shoe horn of ideas" or "The labor of analyzing each stage in the growth of irony would be about as profitable as milking a he goat into a sieve."

Sometimes Mr. Worcester's desire to find an effective example of the kind of satire he is discussing at the moment leads him to perverse literary judgments. Such is the opinion expressed in the following sentence. "Perhaps the finest use of sustained irony (in American letters) occurs in Mark Twain's *The Mysterious*

*Stranger.*" Only Professional naturalists like Theodore Dreiser would share this opinion. In most of this work Clemens completely loses his psychic distance and merely expresses painful personal unhappiness. The doctrines he then announces are crass forms of pessimistic materialism crudely expressed.

However, blemishes of this sort are infrequent. Seldom does Mr. Worcester substitute empty cleverness for criticism. And very often he goes far beyond mere analysis of rhetorical means and manners to reveal sound critical insight. His explanation of the way in which the irony of the Greeks fed the "grand tradition of satire in the western world" is an uncommonly able piece of historical criticism. The book will profit and delight both the professional student of literature and the intelligent general reader.

Columbia University

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

---

*Traditions in American Literature.* By JOSEPH MERSAND. New York: Modern Chapbooks Press, 1939. Pp. xiii + 247. \$2.00. The title of this book is less descriptive than the blurb on the jacket: "A study of Jewish characters and authors in American literature from colonial times to the present day, with copious bibliographies." Such a study has long been needed. This one, however, will be found valuable principally for the material the author has assembled. Mr. Mersand's difficulty seems to have been in deciding upon a definite point of view from which to survey the contribution of the Jew to American literature. Was he interested in evaluating the work of authors of Jewish extraction or the reflection of Jewish life in America as portrayed by both Jews and non-Jews? Perhaps the looseness of his structure is to some extent responsible for the effect of disunity and abortiveness. Certainly the proportions of the various parts indicate neither scholarly nor critical selection. George S. Kaufman, Elmer Rice, Clifford Odets, S. N. Behrman, Irwin Shaw, and Samuel and Bella Spewack, among the dramatists, receive separate chapters; only Robert Nathan and Ben Hecht, among novelists, are given chapters; and no Jewish poet is given separate treatment. None of the collaborators of Kaufman, not even Moss Hart or Marc Connelly, receives more than a cursory mention, and none of the popular Jewish novelists, such as Edna Ferber or Fannie Hurst, is discussed with any degree of comprehensiveness.

Many of Mr. Mersand's off-hand statements invite challenge. The fact that Wexley's plays "were produced in Russia as true representations of phases of American life" (p. 12) does not prove their excellence. Nor is the determination of the Spewacks "to try to improve their technique and broaden the scope of their activities" (p. 77) proof that they can ever attain the "stature

of S. N. Behrman or George S. Kaufman." And the fact that Arthur Guiterman "has published sixteen books of poetry since 1909" (p. 129) may be significant of something, but there still remains the question of the quality of his verse.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

*Positivism in the United States (1853-1861)*. By RICHMOND LAURIN HAWKINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. x + 243. \$3.00. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages, Vol 14.) Professor Hawkins published in 1936 a book entitled *Auguste Comte and the United States (1816-1853)*, and the above volume is a continuation. The record of his search for early traces of Comte in this country now runs to nearly 400 pages. In a footnote (p. 86) in the 1936 instalment he wrote: "At no time before the Civil War were there in the United States more than a half-dozen adults who accepted both the positive philosophy and the Religion of Humanity." In the book under review he writes: "The Protestant United States was poor soil for Comte's theories" (p. 26). Both books are models of scholarly method, and these conclusions are so thoroughly documented and proved that no one will ever be tempted to prove them over again. We might have guessed that the Protestant theologians and professors of philosophy who encountered Comte would have felt bound to oppose him, and now we know that they did. We also learn that the handful who accepted him before the Civil War were men of no great mark or significant influence. The letters printed do not appear to tell us anything about Comte that was not known before. We hear a good deal in the later volume about one of the odd Utopian communities of nineteenth-century America; but this one, unlike some of the others, was obscure while it lasted, and vanished without exerting any influence on the life, thought, or literature of the United States. All in all, Professor Hawkins has conclusively demonstrated that there is nothing in this field of study which should for a moment detain persons with no time to waste.

ROBERT SHAFER

*University of Cincinnati*

*Peter Porcupine in America: The Career of William Cobbett, 1792-1800*. By MARY ELIZABETH CLARK. Philadelphia: Privately printed, 1939. Pp. vi + 193. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation in English.) Miss Clark's aims are "to reconstruct Cobbett's life in Philadelphia in as great detail as possible" and to "show the connection of the writing he did here with the general course of historical events." In addition to Cobbett's works, the chief



source of information for most biographers of this period, Miss Clark has used such materials as the Rush papers at the Library Company of Philadelphia, some unpublished letters (notably a series written to James Mathieu from Wilmington in 1793-94, now at the Huntington Library), and the files of contemporary newspapers. Her contribution is avowedly factual, a considerable expansion of the usual accounts of Cobbett's most eventful stay in the United States, rather than a reinterpretation. It is probable, indeed, that such a biography as Mr. G. D. H. Cole's relates Cobbett's writings more clearly to his time.

This book, nevertheless, will be valuable both to one who seeks to understand the development of Cobbett's political thought and to one who is concerned with the nature and details of the conflict between the Federalists and the Republicans. It indicates how Cobbett learned his trade and made his reputation in Philadelphia, and displays his importance to Americans because his violent pro-British sentiments helped to turn the new nation "away from the monarchical and aristocratic tradition toward Jeffersonian democracy." More problematical, perhaps, is the suggestion that Cobbett's later modifications of political belief "may have been in part a result of his American experience." Miss Clark's explanation of a central puzzle in Cobbett's career—his shift from anti-Jacobin to Radical—seems to be that he was influenced in some way by those principles which he most vigorously attacked. There are many hints here that his position was emotional rather than rational, that patriotism and personalities had a larger part in his life than principles. One may learn a good deal about party politics and men's motives from the experiences of William Cobbett.

*The University of Texas*

THEODORE HORNBERGER

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

A "FALSIFIED VERSE" IN KLEIST'S *Homburg*? The November 1940 issue of this journal contained an interesting contribution by Walter Silz on a disputed reading of Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. Having established the line referred to in Tieck's letter as *Homburg* 594, Mr. Silz plausibly conjectures that it was pointed out to Tieck by one of Kleist's friends long after the poet's death, in fact long after the first appearance of *Homburg* in the *Nachgelassene Schriften*. Mr. Silz is under no illusions as to the dependability of Tieck as an editor, and he cites numerous instances of Tieck's tampering with Kleist's text. Yet he is inclined to side with Tieck in this instance and accept the claim that Kleist wrote "Spanien" when he meant "Frankreich" or that he substituted Spain for France in his manuscript in order to avoid trouble with the censor. Mr. Silz argues

this point of view very ably. Nevertheless I am not convinced. I still believe that Kleist wrote

*Gedrängt von Spaniens Tyrannenheeren,*

as the line stands in all texts save Tieck's text of 1846. The reasons for my conviction may be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) Where political censorship prevails, putting a check on the free expression of political loves and hates, a poet will write, generally speaking, what he can hope to "get away with." It does not seem plausible that a poet—a Kleist, of all poets—should doctor his manuscript in advance to forestall a carping censor. Why, then, should Kleist have done so here?

(2) But even supposing that Kleist was persuaded to change the line in question in the manuscript that the printer was to use in setting up his type, this consideration did not hold good with regard to the manuscript that has come down to us. The extant manuscript was copied, at Kleist's direction, as a gift for a Prussian princess. As such it might be expected to contain Kleist's authentic text, not a version that had been tampered with to please the censor. Yet, as Mr. Silz notes, this manuscript also has the traditional line. Should this be due to an oversight?

(3) There was no reason to expect special vigilance on the censor's part with regard to Kleist's *Homburg*. Unlike the *Hermannsschlacht*, this play is in no way a transparently veiled portrayal of Prussia's struggle against Napoleon.

(4) Making allowance for the common belief that inordinately stupid people were appointed to the post of censor, it is hard to believe—though by no means impossible—that the passage in question should have been deemed offensive even in the phrasing

*Gedrängt von den Tyrannenheeren Frankreichs.*

For here France is shown, at a time remote from the present, as engaged in a war not with Prussia, but with the Netherlands. Moreover, the reference to France occurs in an expository participial clause, at the beginning of a sentence, where it could not possibly have touched off an anti-French outburst of applause during a theatrical performance. Or was the censorship of so iron-clad a nature as to require that under no circumstances was the mention of French armies to be associated with the idea of tyranny?

(5) But let us see what Kleist got away with in his heavily censored *Berliner Abendblätter* on the score of the French. For the issue of October 20, 1810 Kleist revamped an anecdote about a dare-devil Prussian soldier who, taken prisoner after the Battle of Jena, manages to escape and subsequently kills and plunders a goodly number of the French. Recaptured finally and sentenced to be shot, he asks to have a last wish. This being granted, he takes down his trousers and asked to be shot in such a way as to prevent his hide from being punctured.<sup>1</sup> The printed source from which Kleist borrowed this story has the soldier captured by the Bavarians,

<sup>1</sup> *Werke* (B. I<sup>a</sup>.) IV, 190.

Napoleon's "Rheinbund" allies. Reinhold Steig, whose book contains both versions,<sup>2</sup> comments on Kleist's substitution as follows:

Er kann auch die Rheinbunds-Baiern als die Feinde, gegen die er Hasz erwecken will, nicht brauchen. Er kennt nur einen Feind für alles Deutsche. Unbedenklich setzt er die Franzosen statt der Baiern ein.<sup>3</sup>

(6) While this anecdote disposes of the idea that Kleist obligingly coöperated with the censor in order to avoid giving offense to the French, I feel certain for other reasons that Spain is part of the authentic context and that Kleist did not substitute Spain for France in our moot passage as a cautious afterthought. The whole passage reads as follows:

*Gedrängt von Spaniens Tyrannenheeren,  
Weiß Moritz kaum, mein Vetter von Oranien,  
Wo er die eignen Kinder retten soll.*

Who can Moritz be but the well-known son of William the Silent, the successor to his father's policy of waging the fight against Spain? The name of Moritz calls to mind the heroic struggle of the Netherlands against their traditional foe, setting in motion a train of images of high emotional voltage for every German reader of Kleist's day, and the name of Moritz also serves to remind us that *our* play is not contemporaneous with the days of *Egmont* and *Don Carlos* but is laid in a later phase of the struggle. We have moved up in time from those epic days of William the Silent and the Duke of Alva! To this extent our time sense is invited to function despite the manifest interweaving of historical fact and legend in the tissue of the play. But how does Moritz, who died in 1625—fifty years before the battle of Fehrbellin—fit into the picture if we replace Spain by France? In the days of the Great Elector there was no Moritz. It was William the Third of Orange who directed the affairs of his country. Supposing, then, that Kleist was trying to be true to history, he would have written

*Gedrängt von den Tyrannenheeren Frankreichs  
Weiß Wilhelm kaum, mein Vetter von Oranien,  
Wo er die eignen Kinder retten soll.*

Supposing further that the censor objected to the mention of France, Kleist would have replaced the first line by the one we read in our editions, but the name of Wilhelm would have stood!

(7) While this might suffice to clinch the authenticity of the standard version, let us look at one more aspect of the case. As we have seen, the net effect of reading France for Spain is to substitute one historical incongruity for another and to sacrifice in the bargain an historical myth, an emotional complex, rich in associations and sure of an automatic response,—in short, to exchange a "marble hall" of the imagination for a patched piece of scaffolding. Whether Kleist knew his historical facts well enough to do this grafting together of two historical epochs in full awareness I do not claim to know. We all know, however, that the his-

<sup>2</sup> Reinhold Steig, *Heinrich von Kleist's Berliner Kämpfe*, (Berlin und Stuttgart, 1901), 343-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 344-5.

torian among German dramatists, Friedrich Schiller, played with his historic material in sovereign fashion when he presented the destruction of the Great Armada (1588) as coincident with the despatching of the Duke of Alba to the Netherlands (1567). And with the weighty precedent of his beloved *Don Carlos* before his eyes, Kleist would not have been the man to flinch from such a bold telescoping of historical events.

(8) If there is no valid reason for changing the line, how, then, did Tieck come to revise it in 1846?

I think that some admirer of Kleist's, some person well grounded in history but deficient in poetic imagination, discovered the historical inaccuracy of the passage and took exception to it. He was shocked to think that a great patriot should have erred so egregiously in sketching the background of that glorious epoch of Brandenburg's history. Reluctant to charge Kleist with an error that would have compromised a Prussian school-boy, he sought for an explanation. Having found one that seemed inherently plausible,—the stringency of censorship—he nursed it until it grew to the stature of subjective certainty. This achieved, he did his bit to save Kleist's good name by palming theory off as fact upon Kleist's grateful editor.

HERMANN J. WEIGAND

Yale University

ROUSSEAU AND FAUST. Shortly after the publication of my note on *Rousseau and Faust* (MLN., Dec. 1940), I received a courteous note from Professor Albert W. Aron, enclosing a reprint of his article "The Mature Goethe and Rousseau," (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, 1936), in which he traces with full documentation Goethe's interest in Rousseau. At the end he points out the parallel between a passage in the *Rêveries* and the pact in *Faust*. This was the point of my note. I wish to offer to Prof. Aron apologies for my unwitting repetition of a part of his findings and thanks for his gracious attitude in the matter. While reading selections from Rousseau with a class, my eye fell on the passage in question. The resemblance to Goethe's lines struck me instantly; I examined such editions and studies of *Faust* as were available to me, found no allusion to the *Rêveries* and submitted my note. I would add that I am at once gratified to see my conjecture confirmed by Prof. Aron's researches and chagrined to learn that I have repeated a find of his. I was entirely unaware of his investigation until he sent me the reprint.

Reed College

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

THE REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES. We are glad to learn from Professor James R. Sutherland that *The Review of English Studies*, of which he is now the editor, has every intention of carrying on through the war. The *RES* needs and deserves the support of all who are interested in English scholarship.

REC

[The

Bates  
bibliogra  
600-1660  
Index.

xl + 915  
287. \$35

Brown  
plete fr  
poems t  
ford [N  
Pp. xiv  
Standar

Comm  
brief st  
Washing  
Educatio

Day,  
Eleanore  
1651-170  
index of  
1940.  
Bibliogr  
Member

Defer  
of lingu  
privatel

Donne  
his intr  
Reprodu  
1611, w  
Coffin. 2  
Pp. xxx  
Society,

Hank  
works  
Kansas.  
\$1.00.  
Studies,

Heltz  
lish pro  
millan,  
of Engl

Herr,  
mon, a  
Philade

Housn  
Compile  
F. W. H  
Referen

Hoyt,  
Douglas  
ton U.  
(Americ

Hugh  
ford, he

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

**Bateson, F. W. (ed.).**—The Cambridge bibliography of English literature: vol. I, 600-1660; II, 1660-1800; III, 1800-1900; IV, Index. *New York*: Macmillan, 1941. Pp. xl + 912; xx + 1003; xxii + 1098; iv + 287. \$32.50.

**Browning, Robert.**—Poetical works, complete from 1833 to 1868 and the shorter poems thereafter. *London*: Humphrey Milford [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], [1941]. Pp. xiv + 698. \$1.75. (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors.)

**Commission on Teacher Education.**—A brief statement of its origin and scope. *Washington, D. C.*: American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. ii + 18.

**Day, Cyrus Lawrence and Murrie, Eleanore Boswell.**—English song-books, 1651-1702, a bibliography, with a first-line index of songs. *London*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. Pp. xxii + 439. (Printed for the Bibliographical Society, and issued only to Members.)

**Deferrari, Harry A.**—Outline of a theory of linguistic change. *Washington, D. C.*: privately printed, 1941. Pp. ii + 21.

**Donne, John.**—Ignatius his Conclave, or his inthronisation in a late election in hell. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611, with an introduction by Charles M. Coffin. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. Pp. xxxii + 148. \$1.60. (Facsimile Text Society, 53.)

**Hankins, John Erskine.**—The life and works of George Turberville. *Lawrence, Kansas*: U. of Kansas, 1940. Pp. v + 98. \$1.00. (U. of Kansas Pubs., Humanistic Studies, 25.)

**Heltzel, Virgil B. (ed.).**—Types of English prose, non-fiction. *New York*: Macmillan, 1941. Pp. xviii + 678. \$1.50. (Types of English Literature.)

**Herr, Alan Fager.**—The Elizabethan sermon, a survey and a bibliography. Diss. *Philadelphia*: U. of Penn., 1940. Pp. 169.

**Housman, Alfred Edward.**—A bibliography. Compiled by Theodore G. Ehrsam. *Boston*: F. W. Faxon, 1941. Pp. 44. \$1.25. (Useful Reference Series, 66.)

**Hoyt, Charles H.**—Five plays. Edited by Douglas L. Hunt. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp. xvi + 240. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, ix.)

**Hughes, Helen Sard.**—The gentle Hertford, her life and letters. *New York*: Mac-

millan, 1940. Pp. xiv + 506. (A Wellesley College Publication.)

**Manch, Joseph.**—Jonathan Swift and women. *Buffalo, N. Y.*: U. of Buffalo, 1941. Pp. 83. \$0.50. (U. of Buffalo Studies, xvi, 4. Monographs in English, 3.) [A creditable M. A. thesis which surveys in detail the part women play in Swift's life and writings.]

**Milton, John.**—Complete poetical works. Edited with introduction and notes by Harris Francis Fletcher. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, [1941]. Pp. xiv + 574. \$2.80. (A revision of the Cambridge Edition, edited by William Vaughn Moody.)

—Poems. With introduction and notes by James Holly Hanford. *New York*: Thomas Nelson, 1941. Pp. lxxxviii + 582. \$1.50. (Nelson's English Series.)

**Parker, William Riley.**—Milton's contemporary reputation, an essay, together with a tentative list of printed allusions to Milton, 1641-1674, and facsimile reproductions of five contemporary pamphlets written in answer to Milton. *Columbus, Ohio*: Ohio State U. Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 299. (Grad. School Studies, Contributions in Lang. and Lit., 7.)

**Parks, Edd Winfield.**—Charles Egbert Craddock (Mary Noailles Murfree). *Chapel Hill, North Carolina*: U. of N. C. Press, [1941]. Pp. xvi + 258. \$2.50.

**Plato.**—On the trial and death of Socrates, *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito*, *Phaedo*. Translated, with introduction and notes, by Lane Cooper. *Ithaca, N. Y.*: Cornell U. Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 200. \$2.00.

**Poe, Edgar Allan.**—The great tales and poems. Pocket Book Text Series. *New York*: Pocket Books, Inc., 1940. Pp. xiv + 360. \$0.33.

—*Tamerlane* and other poems. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1827, with an introduction by Thomas Ollive Mabbott. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. Pp. lxvi + 40. \$1.80. (Facsimile Text Society, 51.)

**Pope, Alexander.**—Imitations of Horace, with An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and The Epilogue to the Satires. Edited by John Butt. *London*: Methuen, [1939]. Pp. liv + 406. 16/6. (Twickenham Edition of Poems of Alexander Pope, iv.)

—The Rape of the Lock, and other poems. Edited by Geoffrey Tillotson. *London*: Methuen, [1940]. Pp. xx + 410. 16 sh. (Same, ii.)

**Rudman, Harry W.**—Italian nationalism and English letters, figures of the Risorgimento and Victorian men of letters. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. 444. \$3.25. (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 146.)



**Shakespeare.**—*Henry the Fourth, Part Two.* A new variorum edition, ed. Matthias A. Shaaber. *Philadelphia, Pa.*: Lippincott, 1940. Pp. xx + 715. \$7.50.

**Speare, M. E. (ed.).**—*The Pocket Book of Verse, great English and American poems.* *New York*: Pocket Books, Inc., 1940. Pp. xxvi + 422. \$0.25.

**Stauffer, Donald A.**—*The art of biography in eighteenth century England, and Bibliographical supplement.* *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 572, x + 293. \$5.00 each, \$8.50 together.

**Sutherland, Arthur Bruce.**—*Maurice Hewlett: historical romancer.* *Diss. Philadelphia*: U. of Penn., 1938. Pp. x + 199.

**University of Toronto Quarterly.**—*Reprints: Arthur Barker, "The pattern of Milton's Nativity Ode," and E. K. Brown, "Thomas Wolfe: realist and symbolist."* *Toronto*: U. of Toronto Quarterly, x (Jan., 1941). Pp. 167-81, 153-66.

**Williams, Margaret (transl. and arr.).**—*Word-Hoard, passages from Old English literature from the sixth to the eleventh centuries.* *New York*: Sheed and Ward, 1940. Pp. xvi + 459. \$4.00.

**Wolfe, Don M.**—*Milton in the Puritan Revolution.* *New York*: Thomas Nelson, 1941. Pp. xvi + 496. \$4.00.

**Wordsworth, William.**—*Poetical works,—poems written in youth, poems referring to the period of childhood.* Edited from the manuscripts, with textual and critical notes by E. de Selincourt. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. xvi + 379. \$6.00.

**Wynn, Dudley Taylor.**—*A critical study of the writings of Mary Hunter Austin (1868-1934).* *Abridgement of diss.* *New York*: N. Y. U., 1941. Pp. ii + 22.

### GERMAN

**Bansa, Elfriede.**—*Bettina von Arnims Verhältnis zur Kunst.* *Diss. Frankfurt. Würzburg*: K. J. Tritsch, 1938. 70 pp.

**Behne, Hermann.**—*Wilhelm Waiblinger. Eine neue Würdigung seines Lebens und Schaffens.* *Berlin*: Behr's Verlag, 1939. 243 pp., 3 plates. M. 5.00.

**Bohnenblust, Gottfried.**—*Carl Spitteler.* [Aus: *Grosse Schweizer.* 1938]. *Zürich*: Atlantis Verl. [1938]. 9 pp.

— *Conrad Ferdinand Meyer.* [Aus: *Grosse Schweizer.* 1938]. *Zürich*: Atlantis Verl. [1938]. 8 pp.

— *Die Dichtung der Eidgenossenschaft.* [Aus: *Die Schweiz—Mein Land.* 1939]. *Olten*: Walter [1939]. 8 pp. 4°.

**Debrunner, A.**—*Aus der Krankheitsgeschichte des Genitivs.* Vortrag, gehalten im

"Verein für deutsche Sprache" in Bern am 10. Nov. 1939. [Aus: *Berner Schulblatt.* 1939/40, Nr. 39-41]. *Bern*: Eicher & Roth [1939]. 29 pp.

**Dittrich, Marie-Luise.**—*Sechzehn lateinische Gedichte Willrams von Ebersberg.* *Diss. Göttingen, Teildruck.* [Aus: *Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altertum* Bd. 76, H. 1/2]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1939. 19 pp.

**Feuchte, Herbert.**—*Theodor Storm und die Romantik.* *Diss. Hamburg*: 1940. 78 pp.

**Fifty Years of German Drama. A Bibliography of Modern German Drama, 1880-1930, Based on the Loewenberg Collection in the Johns Hopkins University Library. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. ix, 111 pp. \$3.75.**

**Goedeke.**—*Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung.* N. F. (Fortführung von 1830 bis 1880). Im Auftrag d. Preuss. Akademie d. Wiss. hrsg. von Georg Minde-Pouet. Lfg. 1. *Dresden*: Ehlermann, 1940. vi, 208 pp. M. 18.00.

**Goldschmidt, Hermann L.**—*Der Geist der Erziehung bei Jeremias Gotthelf.* *Bern, Leipzig*: Haupt, 1939. 52 pp. Fr. 2.

**Grundmann, Karl.**—*Zur Entwicklung der Schilderung des Lanzenkampfes in der höfischen Epik. Das Anrennen und die Haltung des Ritters.* *Warschau*: 1936. 35 pp.

**Hahne, Franz.**—*Kleidersellerbüchlein. Urkunden zum Leben des Braunschweigischen Kreises um Wilhelm Raabe.* Im Auftr. der Raabe-Ges. hrsg. *Wolfenbüttel*: Heckner, 1939. 150 pp., 6 plates.

**Houben, Heinrich.**—*Der Henese-Fleck. Das Krämerlatein der Breyeller. Ein belehrendes und unterhaltendes Büchlein über eine alte Geheimsprache.* (Hrsg. von Verkehrs- und Verschönerungsverein der Gemeinde Breyell). [Breyell: Goertz, 1939]. 52 pp.

**Hermann, Eduard.**—*Althochdeutsche Kleinigkeiten.* [Nachrichten von d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 3, Nr. 3]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940. 37-51 pp. M. 1.

**Kaprolat, Richard.**—*Chr. D. Grabbes Drama "Napoleon oder die hundert Tage." Eine Interpretation.* *Diss. Münster. Lengerich, Westf.*: Lengericher Handelsdruckerei, 1939. 129 pp.

**Koppelman, H. L.**—*Ursachen des Lautwandels.* *Leiden*: Sijthoff, 1939. 156 pp. Fl. 4.50.

**Koppensteiner, R.**—*Wortschatz für den Sippenforscher. Altes und fremdes Sprachgut aus alten Matrikeln und Urkunden.* *Wien*: Paul Kaltschmid [1939]. 78 pp. M. 3.

**Kossat, Ernst.**—*Wesen und Aufbauformen der Lyrik Georg Trakls.* [Dichtung, Wort und Sprache. H. 3]. *Diss. Hamburg*: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1939. 102 pp. M. 3.60.



**Kralik, Dietrich von.**—Die geschichtlichen Züge der deutschen Heldendichtung. [Aus: Akademie d. Wiss. in Wien, Almanach. Jg. 89. 1939]. Wien: Staatsdruckerei, 1939. 23 pp. M. 1.20.

**Kraus, Carl von.**—Des Minnesangs Frühling. Nach Karl Lachmann, Moriz Haupt und Friedrich Vogt neu bearbeitet. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1940. xviii, 541 pp. M. 10.

— Zum "Saelden Hort" und zu Seifrits "Alexander." [Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Abt. Jg. 1940, H. 1]. München: C. H. Beck, 1940. 22 pp. M. 1.40.

**Mann, Thomas.**—Selected Essays, Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by Uland E. Fehlau and Charles W. Rechenbach. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1941. xvi, 186 pp. \$1.40.

**Meulen, R. van der.**—Over het woord sabel. [Mededeelingen d. Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde. N. R. Deel 3, No. 5]. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandische Uitgevers Mij [1940]. 44 pp. Fl. 80.

**Meyer, Anton Hans.**—Die "Himmel-Schlüssel" des Hans Assmann von Abschatz. Formanalyse, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Problem der "Wechselseitigen Erhellung der Künste." Diss. Münster. Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus, 1939. viii, 37 pp.

**Misteli, Paul.**—Das "Denkmahl" in der deutschschweizerischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Zürich. Affoltern am Albis: Weiss, 1939. 123 pp.

**Müller, Herbert.**—Die Variation in der altgermanischen, alt- und mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung. Eine stilgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Diss. Leipzig. Würzburg-Aumühle: K. Triltsch, 1939. xii, 339 pp.

**Nolte, Fred O.**—Lessing's *Laokoon*. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press, 1940. 175 pp. \$2.00.

**Panzer, Friedrich.**—Gahmuret. Quellenstudien zu Wolframs Parzifal. [Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1939/40, Abh. 1]. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1940. 80 pp. M. 4.

**Pauquet, Peter Paul.**—Schöpferische Angst. Versuch einer Angst-Kosmologie bei Reiner Maria Rilke. Diss. Bonn. Teildruck. Oberpleis: 1939. 109 pp.

**Rödy, Georg M.**—Die Merseburger Zaubersprüche. Privatdruck, 300 num. Ex. Birkesdorf-Düren: Ragier, 1940. 12 pp., 1 facsimile. 4°.

**Roukens, Win.**—Wort- und Sachgeographie Südost-Niederlands und der umliegenden Gebiete. Mit bes. Berücksichtigung des Volkskundlichen. T. 1A. 1B. Nymegen: Uitgevers

Mij "De Gelderlander," 1937. xi, 487 pp., 8°, Atlas, 7, 90, 10 plates, 4°. Fl. 18.

**Rüdiger, Hans Helmut.**—Liederreda und germanische Seele. Diss. Leipzig. [Germanische Studien. H. 215]. Berlin: Ebering, 1939. 243 pp. M. 9.60.

**Runge, F. F.**—Das Gift in der deutschen Sprache. H. 1. Oranienburg 1857. Neudruck. Oranienburg: Torner, 1938. 31 pp. 45 Pf.

**Ryssel, Fritz Heinrich.**—Friedrich Gottlob Wetzel innerhalb der geistigen und politischen Erneuerung Deutschlands im Zeitalter der Romantik. Diss. Frankfurt. Darmstadt: Wittich, 1939. 110 pp.

**Schmidt, Peter Heinrich.**—Goethe als Geograph. [Veröffentlichungen d. Handels-Hochschule St. Gallen. Reihe B, H. 4]. St. Gallen: Fehr, 1939. 48 pp. Fr. 2.25.

**Schulte Strathaus, Ernst.**—Goethes Faust-Fragment. Eine buchkundliche Untersuchung. [Schriften der Corona. 26]. München: Oldenbourg; Zürich: Verl. der Corona, 1940. 32 pp., 6 leaves. M. 4.50.

**Steiner, Emil.**—Geschichtlicher und geographischer Abriss der schweizerdeutschen Mundart. Mit Sprachkarte der Schweiz. Basel: Wepf & Co., 1937. 64 pp. Fr. 7. .

— Prinzipien der deutschen Sprachwissenschaft. Basel: Wepf & Co., 1937. 246 pp. Fr. 9.

**Steinkuhl, Wilhelmine.**—Die Hölderlinsche Mitte. Interpretationen aus dem Schaffen der Frankfurter und Homburger Jahre. Diss. Münster. Emsdetten: Lechte, 1939. 64 pp.

**Steude, Heinz.**—Die Wiederentdeckung Grimmelschausens durch die Romantik und ihre deutsche Bedeutung. Diss. Würzburg: Mayr, 1939. 169 pp.

**Stöckli, Alban.**—Der Dichter Rudolf von Ins, Schreiber auf der Au bei Bremgarten. Eine literarische Skizze. Wohlau, Aargau: Meyer [1939]. 20 pp. Fr. 2.

— Das Zeugnis Ulrichs von Singenberg über Walther von der Vogelweide. [Aus: Ostschweiz. 1940]. [Stans, Schweiz: P. Alban Stöckli], 1940. 16 pp.

— Der Minnesänger von Trossberg. Eine literarische Studie. [Stans, Schweiz: P. Alban Stöckli] 1940. 17 pp.

**Streinz, Franz.**—Die Flurnamen der Gemeinde Bergersdorf. [Arbeitskreis für Volkskunde. Flugschriftenreihe. Nr. 1]. Iglau: Selbstverl. 1939. 9 pp.

**Usinger, Fritz.**—Geist und Gestalt. Darmstadt: Darmstädter Verl. 1939. 155 pp. M. 5.40.

**Waggener, Karl Heinrich.**—Das Jahr des Herrn. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Jane F. Goodloe. With a Foreword by P. G. Gleis. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1941. xi, 234 pp. \$1.40.

Wall, Fr. Wilh. de.—Studien zum Stil der "Kudrun." Diss. Königsberg. Düsseldorf: Nolte, 1939. iv, 75 pp.

Wartburgkrieg, Der. Kritisch herausgegeben von Dr. T. A. Rompelman. Amsterdam: 1939. vi, 355 pp. Fl. 5.25.

## FRENCH

Barton, F. B., and Sirich, E. H.—Simplified Fr. Review. Grammar and Composition. New York: Crofts, 1941. xiv + 219 pp. \$1.60.

Baym, Max I.—Baudelaire and Shakespeare. Reprinted from the Shakespeare Ass. Bulletin, XV, nos. 3 and 4. 29 pp.

Dettmer, Gustav.—Die Geisteshaltung Clément Marots auf Grund seiner religiös-satirischen Lyrik. Diss. Greifswald: 1940. 106 pp.

Dow, Neal.—The Concept and Term "Nature" in Montaigne's *Essays*. U. of Pa. diss., 1940. x + 68 pp.

Grubbs, H. A.—Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, his life and works. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1941. viii + 310 pp. \$3.00.

Leitolf, Otto.—Die Gedankenwelt von Henri Massis. [Romanische Studien. H. 53]. Munich diss. Berlin: Ebering, 1940. 118 pp. M. 4.80.

March, Harold.—Types of the Fr. Short Story, ed. H. M. New York: Nelson, 1941. 339 pp. \$1.50.

Monod-Cassidy, Hélène.—Un voyageur-philosophe au XVIII<sup>e</sup> s., l'abbé J.-B. Le Blanc. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1941. xiii + 565 pp. \$5.00.

Rosenfield, Lenora Cohen.—From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine. New York: Oxford U. Press, 1941. xxviii + 353 pp. \$3.50.

Saylor, G. R.—Alphonse Daudet as a Dramatist. U. of Pa. diss., 1940. vi + 122 pp.

Schwarz, H. S.—Lever de Rideau, six one-act mod. comedies. New York: Dryden Press, 1940. xiv + 233 pp. \$1.35.

Société historique franco-américaine, les Quarante Ans de la. Conférences, allocutions et discours. Préface de G. Chinard. Boston: 1940. 878 pp.

Van der Wal, J. S.—Charles de Bernard (1804-50). Amsterdam diss., 1940. 274 pp.

## ITALIAN

Buonocore, O.—S. Pietro nella Divina Commedia. Napoli: tip. Portosalvo, 1939. 44 pp.

Burich, E. (ed.).—Lettere inedite del Capponi ad A. Reumont. (In aggiunta una lettera del Tommaseo). Fiume: Termini, 1940. 63 pp.

Cioffari, Vincenzo.—The Conception of Fortune and Fate in the Works of Dante.

Cambridge, Mass.: Dante Society, 1940. 40 pp.

Contini, G.—Esercizi di lettura sopra autori contemporanei con un'appendice su testi non contemporanei. Firenze: Parenti, 1939. 303 pp.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—The Prince and Other Works, including Reform in Florence, Castruccio Castracani, On Fortune, Letters, Ten Discourses on Livy. New Translations, Introductions and Notes by Allan H. Gilbert. Chicago: Packard and Co., 1941. 336 pp. \$1.00. (University Classics.)

Momo, A.—La lirica di Torquato Tasso. Milano: tip. Vitagliano, 1939. 183 pp.

Rezza, C.—Impressioni e note sul libro delle rime di Fr. Sacchetti. Empoli: tip. dei Comuni, 1939. 129 pp.

Sapegno, N.—Tecnica, poetica e poesia nelle opere giovanili di Dante. A cura di G. Berretta. Roma: Casa ed. Castellani, 1939. 184 pp.

Speroni, Charles.—Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases in Basile's "Pentameron." Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1941. (Univ. of Calif. Publications in Modern Philology, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 181-288.)

Spini, G. (ed.).—Il granduca di Toscana Cosimo de' Medici. Lettere. Con prefaz. di A. Panella. Firenze: Vallecchi, 1940. xvi + 221 pp.

## SPANISH

Galdós, Pérez.—La Batalla de los Arapiles, ed. J. B. Rael. New York: Odyssey Press, 1941. xiv + 194 pp. \$1.00.

García Prada, C.—Luz que flota en el olvido. Mexico: Imprenta Universitaria, 1939. 131 pp. \$1.20.

Guzmán, Augusto.—Hist. de la novela boliviana. La Paz: Revista México, 1938. 216 pp.

Hommage à E. Martinenche. Paris: d'Artrey (1939). 537 pp.

Lincoln, J. N.—Guide to the Bibliog. and Hist. of Hispano-Amer. Lit. Ann Arbor: 1939. 43 pp.

Manzoni, A. C.—El indio en la poesía de América. Buenos Aires: Torres, 1939.

Mendez Plancarte, Gabriel.—Horacio en México. Mexico: Eds. de la Univ. nacional, 1937. xxviii + 333 pp.

## GENERAL

Analecta AEGYPTIACA. Vol. I: Kopenhagener Texte zum demotischen Weisheitsbuch, ed. Aksel Volten. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1940. Kr. 30.

Chambrun, R. de.—De la Lorraine à Washington (trad. de l'anglais, "I saw France fall"). New York: Brentano's, 1941. 237 pp.

1  
—  
0.

a  
u  
i,

d  
,  
,  
,  
,  
,  
,  
,  
.

o.

o  
.

a  
li  
,

-  
,"  
f  
t.  
,

a  
li  
i

,  
,

l  
,

a  
t.

:

d  
;

e

n  
,

-  
-

-  
-

-  
a  
t.



# NEW COLUMBIA BOOKS

---

## THE BRONTES' WEB OF CHILDHOOD

By FANNIE ELIZABETH RATCHFORD

\$3.50

## THE IMAGINARY VOYAGE IN PROSE FICTION

A History of Its Criticism and a Guide for Its Study, with an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800

By PHILLIP BABCOCK GOVE

\$3.50

## THE ITALIAN LANGUAGE

By MARIO A. PEI

\$3.00

## AN INDEX TO THE COLUMBIA EDITION OF THE WORKS OF JOHN MILTON

By FRANK ALLEN PATTERSON

Assisted by French Rowe Fogle

Two volumes, \$12.50

## THE POEMS OF EMILY JANE BRONTE

Edited by C. W. HATFIELD

\$2.80

## THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY BACKGROUND

Studies on the Idea of Nature in the Thought of the Period

By BASIL WILLEY

\$3.25

## NATURAL SCIENCE IN GERMAN ROMANTICISM

By ALEXANDER GODE VON AESCH

\$3.00

## ENGLISH INSTITUTE ANNUAL, 1940

\$2.00

## SEVENTY BOOKS ABOUT BOOK-MAKING

A Guide to the Study and Appreciation of Printing

By HELLMUT LEHMANN-HAUPT

\$1.00

### *Four New Facsimiles*

## THE POEMS OF SIR JOHN DAVIES

Reproduced from the First Editions in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery

With an Introduction and Notes by CLARE HOWARD

\$3.00

## IGNATIUS HIS CONCLAVE, OR HIS INTHRONISATION IN A LATE ELECTION IN HELL

By JOHN DONNE

Reproduced from the Edition of 1611

With an Introduction by CHARLES M. COFFIN

\$1.60

## LETTERS OF JONATHAN OLDSTYLE

By WASHINGTON IRVING

Reproduced from the Edition of 1824

With an Introduction by STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

\$1.60

## TAMERLANE AND OTHER POEMS

By EDGAR ALLAN POE

Reproduced from the Edition of 1827

With an Introduction by THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT

\$1.80

*Write for full information.*

**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS**

MORNINGSIDE HEIGHTS

NEW YORK



**For Early Publication:**

**INTRODUCTION TO SPANISH**

By **L. H. TURK**, *DePauw University*

Extensively classroom-proved before publication for the reduction of difficulties to a minimum. Establishes a basic vocabulary and provides abundance of reading.

**HILLS & FORD: FIRST SPANISH COURSE, REVISED**

Revised by **G. RIVERA**, *Harvard University*

The revision effects a systematic building of vocabulary, but retains the prized features of the original.

**STANDARD LIST OF SPANISH WORDS AND IDIOMS**

By **HAYWARD KENISTON**, *University of Michigan*

Includes over 90% of the vocabulary used in average Spanish text—the words and idioms essential to successful progress in Spanish.

**D. C. HEATH**



**AND COMPANY**

*April publication*

**LATINOAMERICANOS**

**WILLIS K. JONES AND MIRIAM HANSEN**  
**MIAMI UNIVERSITY**

The gaucho, the oil driller, the plantation owner, the rubber worker—and many other Latin-American types are colorfully portrayed in this collection of stories by great Hispanic-American writers. For intermediate students, this text provides timely and informative material in an interesting and entirely different way.

**Holt**

**257 Fourth Avenue**

**New York**